REPORT RESUMES

ED 010 619 24

PERCEPTIONS BY ADOLESCENTS OF VARIOUS PROCEDURAL APPROACHES USED IN FILMED COUNSELING SESSIONS.

BY- BOWN, OLIVER H. AND OTHERS
TEXAS UNIV., AUSTIN

REPORT NUMBER CRP-3284 PUB DATE 66
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-0546
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.36 HC-$8.12 203P.

DESCRIPTORS- *ADOLESCENTS, *COUNSELING PROGRAMS, *INDIVIDUAL COUNSELING, FILMS, STUDENT EVALUATION, *COUNSELORS, GUIDANCE COUNSELING, SIMULATION, GRADE 9, GRADE 12, AGE DIFFERENCES, SEX DIFFERENCES, PROBLEM SOLVING, ABILITY GROUPING, PROGRAM EVALUATION, *TEACHER EVALUATION, STUDENT REACTION, AUSTIN, TEXAS, WESTCOTT PROBLEM SOLVING SCALE

SUBJECTS (398) IN THE NINTH AND 12TH GRADES, BOTH MALE AND FEMALE, WERE ASKED TO RATE INITIAL, FILMED COUNSELING SESSIONS AS IF THEY WERE THE COUNSELEE. FIVE DIFFERENT COUNSELING APPROACHES WERE USED IN THE FILMED SESSIONS--(1) ADVICE GIVING - THE COUNSELOR ADVISES THE CLIENT ON A PROGRAM OF ACTION, (2) QUESTIONING - THE COUNSELOR POSES A QUESTION TO THE CLIENT PRIOR TO EACH CLIENT RESPONSE, (3) REFLECTION OF FEELING - THE COUNSELOR RESPONDS WITH FEELING APPROPRIATE TO THE CONTENT OF CLIENT RESPONSES, (4) SUPPORTING - THE COUNSELOR ATTEMPTS TO CONVEY TO THE CLIENT THAT THE CLIENT HAS "WHAT IT TAKES" TO WORK A PROBLEM OUT, AND (5) INFORMATION GIVING - THE COUNSELOR PROVIDES INFORMATION OF A SPECIFIC RELEVANT NATURE TO THE CLIENT. AFTER COMPLETING THE "WESTCOTT PROBLEM SOLVING SCALE," THE SUBJECTS WERE DIVIDED INTO FOUR COGNITIVE GROUPS, BASED UPON THEIR SCORES ON THE INSTRUMENT'S TWO DIMENSIONS--(1) THE AMOUNT OF INFORMATION REQUIRED OR DEMANDED FOR SOLVING THE PROBLEMS AND (2) THE DEGREE OF SUCCESS IN SOLUTION OF THE PROBLEMS. THE GROUPS WERE THUS LOW DEMAND-HIGH SUCCESS, LOW DEMAND-LOW SUCCESS, HIGH DEMAND-HIGH SUCCESS, AND HIGH DEMAND-LOW SUCCESS. ANALYSIS OF DATA OBTAINED FROM COUNSELOR RATING AND COUNSELOR RANKING FORMS (COMPLETED BY ALL SUBJECTS AFTER VIEWING THE FILMED SESSIONS) YIELDED INFORMATION CONCERNING THE PREFERENCES AND REJECTIONS OF THE COUNSELING APPROACHES AMONG THE FOUR COGNITIVE GROUPS. ALL FOUR GROUPS TENDED TO PREFER THE ADVICE GIVING APPROACH AND TO REJECT THE REFLECTION OF FEELING APPROACH. BOTH HIGH DEMAND GROUPS ALSO PREFERRED THE SUPPORTING APPROACH. THE QUESTIONING APPROACH WAS REJECTED BY ALL THE MALES. ALL FEMALES EXCEPT THE HIGH DEMAND-LOW SUCCESS GROUP REJECTED THE INFORMATION GIVING APPROACH. YOUNGER SUBJECTS TENDED TO RATE BOTH THE ADVICE GIVING AND SUPPORTING APPROACHES HIGHER THAN OLDER SUBJECTS. (JH)

ED010619

PERCEPTIONS BY ADOLESCENTS OF VARIOUS PROCEDURAL APPROACHES USED IN FILMED COUNSELING SESSIONS

Cooperative Research Project No. 3284

Oliver H. Bown
Lewis F. James
Royal B. Embree, Jr.
JoNell James
Coystal Stone

The University of Texas

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION AND WELFARE
Office of Education
This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated do not necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

PERCEPTIONS BY ADOLESCENTS OF VARIOUS PROCEDURAL APPROACHES USED IN FILMED COUNSELING SESSIONS

Cooperative Research Project No. 3284

5-0546

Oliver H. Bown
Lewis F. James
Royal B. Embree, Jr.
JoNell James
Coystal Stone

The University of Texas
Austin, Texas
1966

The research reported herein was supported by the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

I. INTRODUCTION 1

Counselor-Client Interaction: The Counseling Relationship. 5
The Problem 12
Summary 17

II. RELEVANT RESEARCH. 19

Counselor Approach 19
Problem Solving Behavior 23
Pilot Study of Counselor Approaches. . 32
Hypotheses. 41

III. PROCEDURES 54

Script Production. 54
Film Production. 59
Film Presentation. 69
Scoring of Instruments 71
Statistical Procedures 75

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION 79

Tests of Hypothesis 82
Factor Analysis of Rating Scale Responses. 138
Conclusions and Implications for Research 148

APPENDIX. 153

REFERENCES 187

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Judges' Errors in Sorting Counselor Responses without Context. 58

2. Ratings of Judges of Counselor Responses as to the Degree the Responses are in Keeping with Approaches Defined. 60

3. Mean of Judges Ratings of Each Response. 61

4. Order of Counselors and Techniques in Which Film Sequences Were Shown . . . 68

5. Number of Subjects Classified by Grade and by Sex. 70

6. Number of Male and Female Subjects Classified by Information Demand and Problem Solving Success on Westcott Scale. 74

7. Means of Low ID-High PSS Male Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously. . . . 83

8. The Number of Low ID-High PSS Male Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-preference for the Information Giving Approach by Rank Score When Compared to all Other Approaches. . 85

9. Means of Low ID-Low PSS Male Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously. . . . 87

10. The Number of Low ID-Low PSS Male Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-preference for the Advising Approach When Compared to all Other Approaches. 89

Table Page

11. Means of High ID-High PSS Male Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously. 91

12. The Number of High ID-High PSS Male Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-preference for the Supporting Approach When Compared to all Other Approaches. 93

13. Means of High ID-Low PSS Male Ratings of Counselor Approaches 94

14. The Number of High ID-Low PSS Males Indicating Preference for Specific Approaches in Comparison to all Other Approaches 96

15. Means of Low ID-High PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously. 99

16. The Number of Low ID-High PSS Female Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-preference for the Reflection of Feeling Approach When Compared to all Other Approaches. 100

17. Means of Low ID-Low PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously 102

18. Means of Low ID-Low PSS Male and Female Ratings of Advising Approach. . . 103

19. The Number of Low ID-Low PSS Female Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-preference for the Advising Approach When Compared to all Other Approaches. 104

Table Page

20. Number of Low ID-Low PSS Females and Males Ranking the Advising Approach About the Grand Median Rank Score Obtained from Both Groups Combined. 106

21. Means of High ID-High PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously 109

22. Means of High ID-High PSS Male and Female Ratings of Supporting Approach. 110

23. The Number of High ID-High PSS Female Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-preference for the Supporting Approach When Compared to all Other Approaches. 111

24. The Number of High ID-High PSS Females and Males Ranking the Supporting Approach About the Grand Median Rank Score Obtained from Both Groups Combined. 113

25. Means of High ID-Low PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches. 115

26. Mean Ratings of all Groups of all Counseling Approaches. 117

27. The Number of High ID-Low PSS Females Indicating Preference for Specific Approaches in Comparison to all Other Approaches. 118

28. Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-High PSS Males Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach. 120

Table Page

29. Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and High ID-Low PSS Males Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach. 121

30. Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and High ID-High PSS Males Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach. 122

31. Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-Low PSS Males Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach. 123

32. Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-Low PSS Females Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach. 124

33. Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-High PSS Females Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach. 125

34. Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and High ID-High PSS Females Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach. 126

35. Mean Ratings of all Ninth and Twelfth Grade Subjects on Advising and Supporting Approaches. 130

Table Page

36. The Number of Ninth and Twelfth Grade Subjects Ranking the Advising Approach Above or Below the Median of the Combined Groups. 131

37. The Number of Ninth and Twelfth Grade Subjects Ranking the Supporting Approach Above and Below the Median of the Combined Groups 132

38. Summary of Preferences for and Rejections of all Counseling Approaches by all Cognitive Groups and by Sex. 135

39. Factor Loadings by Item Scores and Total Scores of all Males on Counselor Rating Scale 139

40. Factor Loadings by Item Scored and Total Scores of all Females on Counselor Rating Scale 141

41. Factor Loadings by Item Scores and Total Scores of Pilot Study Males on Counselor Rating Scale. 142

42. Factor Matching Males vs. Females of Five Factors Extracted from Each Sample. 144

43. Factor Matching Males vs. Pilot Study Males of Five Factors Extracted from Each Sample 145

44. Factor Matching Females vs. Pilot Study Males of Five Factors Extracted from Each Sample 146

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Potential strengths and weaknesses of various counselor approaches have been discussed and emphasized for several years. McNair and Lorr, however, (1964, p. 265) expressed disatisfaction with the fact that "Solid research evidence for the impact of the therapist is meager." Other researchers (Stevenson, 1959) (Astin, 1961) have stated that there have been more publications and research indicating the scope of problems involved in the evaluation of psychotherapy than sound results from experimentation designed to study its effects.

Astin (1961) has inappropriately and prematurely expressed disatisfaction with counseling research in arguing that counseling is "functionally autonomous." Though disenchanted with the process of counseling, he suggests that there are basic questions about therapeutic concepts which have not been studied thoroughly, and new approaches in experimental design may prove more fruitful.

For example, the suggestion by Frank (1958) of the administration of different amounts of "independent variables" to different groups was deemed appropriate by Cross (1964) who complained of its infrequent use. The focus of research exploring variables related to successful psychotherapy has been on three different aspects of counseling:

1. Client variables and their relationship to successful therapy.
2. Counselor variables and their relationship to successful therapy.
3. Client-counselor interaction dimensions or "therapeutic relationship" and successful therapy.

Client Variables

In a review of the prognostic studies in therapy, Windle (1952, p. 464-467) offers his conclusions and estimates of the value of some of the instruments often employed to describe client variables. He stated that:

> The foregoing review of the prognostic utility of the Rorscharch has failed to disclose any very encouraging concordance among studies for any diagnostic category. Prognostic studies of psychotics using the MMPI exhibit

> a large amount of disagreement among conclusions...(some of which) can be attributed to differences in types of patients studied.

Continuing in his review, he (Windle, 1952, p. 467) remarked:

> ...All in all, it does not appear that objective criteria have been found through which the TAT can be of prognostic use... The Mosaic test has also been asserted to be of prognostic utility but again there are no studies that have demonstrated its value in this area. Diamond and Schmale have described a technique that is an offshoot of the Mosaic Test but...as yet its usefulness remains undemonstrated.

Studies using descriptions of personality traits of clients as variables in prognosis have proven confusing and conflicting, although the area has been investigated with some thoroughness.

"Expression of feeling" by the client as rated by independent judges was found by Snyder (1961) to be positively correlated with successful therapy but his sample (N=5) was too small for conclusive results. In a similar approach Blau (1950) developed a scale based on clients' self statements from taped interviews, again rated by independent judges. The more positive and/or ambivalent the self reference during the interview, the better the prediction for success.

The use of tests of mental ability as prognostic indicators has met with some success. It appears that some types of cognitive functioning are positively correlated with success of therapy. Studies using patterns of ability for prognosis indicate promise but have not yet been investigated thoroughly (Windle, 1952).

Counselor Variables

Considerable research has been related to the posture of the counselor in the process of therapy. Fiedler (1950a, 1950b) developed a Q Sort which purported to measure the degree to which different counselors approached the Ideal Therapeutic Relationship (ITR). He discovered a high correlation among therapists of different orientations; and found that as therapists gained experience, they approached the ITR. Judged or therapist reported "empathetic understanding" was found by Lesser (1961) to be unrelated to counseling progress measured by change between self and self-ideal Q Sorts. Streitfield (1959) found expressed acceptance of others and ratings of competency by superiors unrelated.

On the other hand, counselor experience has been found to be positively related with outcome of therapy independently of ITR (Gonyea, 1962). Effectiveness (outcome) and quality of relationship (ITR) are related to experience but not to each other. Some earlier studies found no relationship between sex and duration or between sex and improvement (Lorr, Katz and Rubinstein, 1958) (Sullivan, Miller and Smelser, 1958).

When client improvement was based on pre- and post-TAT and Butler Q Sorts, Cartwright and Vogel (1960) found a positive correlation between success and experience of counselors. In fact, changes in clients working with inexperienced counselors tended to be in a negative direction. Myers and Auld (1955) and Katz, Lorr and Rubinstein (1958) also found a relationship between counselor experience and outcome of therapy. Though the approaches have not yet been related empirically to outcome or quality of relationship, Campbell (1962) discovered that female counselor trainees practiced more information gathering and supporting that did male trainees.

Counselor-Client Interaction: The Counseling Relationship

The agreement by therapists as to what a good counseling relationship is has been well described in the previously cited studies by Fiedler (1950a, 1950b); and all counselors try to achieve the aforementioned relationship in the counseling process. Parloff (1961) suggested the ITR is positively related to outcome and correlated the ITR with 14 measures of outcome using a small N of both counselors and clients. Only three were weakly significant, but the results suggested that the counselor is responsible for outcome via his skill in establishing the ITR. Gonyea (1962) deemed Parloff's results as spurious and found that, though the quality of the relationship may be determined by the therapist, the ITR has no relationship to counseling outcome as measured by self description. He further noted, however,

> ... there remains to be explained how so many experts have come to so much agreement about an apparently false or at least irrelevant ideal.

Eaton (1959) and Lesser (1961) both suggested that the ITR may, in fact, result in less movement in therapy in that the client may become dependent and attempt to remain dependent. A "dependency-nurturing" concept, characterizing some counselors, was discussed by Steiper and Weiner (1959).

Variations in Described Counselor-Client Relationship

Fundamental to most theories of counseling is the assumption of the necessity of the counselor-client relationship. A variety of concepts have been used to characterize and measure this relationship. Fiedler (1950) described it with dimensions such as ease of communication, emotional distance, and status. Sundland and Barker (1962) state that Fiedler's dimensions provide little discrimination among therapists. Fey (1958), using an oblique factor design, found one factor clearly resembling Fiedler's single factor "idealness" with another three factors resembling the personal, nondirective factors found by McNair and Lorr (1964).

The description of the counseling relationship in all of the above research designs was obtained from sources other than the client. Fey (1958, p. 408) expresses reservations about his results in that "...these are ways in which clinicians are willing to describe themselves." Secondly, Fey (1958, p. 409) stated that "...questionnaire items represent the language and concerns of a clinician whose orientation is largely Rogerian." This would seem reasonable since studies previously cited indicate that counselors of different orientations attempt to achieve a similar, if not identical, Rogerian relationship with the client -- regardless of the descriptive terminology employed.

McNair and Lorr (1964) focused on the counselors "report of their preferred treatment technique." Although the items used in their questionnaire did discriminate between types of counselors, the separation was poor and correlations between descriptive factors were high. The low interval consistency of the factor scales and factor inter-correlations may indicate that their factors were multivocal, much the same as those of Sundland and Barker (1962). Another possible interpretation is that they tapped a single second order factor resembling that of Fey (1958) and Sundland and Barker (1962).

Sundland and Barker (1962) also focused on counselors' reports in the construction of the Therapists Orientation Questionnaire. The findings of this study are inconclusive due to lack of clairty of the multiple factor structure and reliance on extremely small numbers of items within those scales. Sundland and Barker take issue with Fiedler and the ITR as a simple descriptive factor. Aside from the deficiencies of the Sundland and Barker report, it should be noted that the report deals with what counselors say they do; while Fiedler (1950) rated the actual tapes of what the counselors did in therapy.

Regardless of what differences in theoretical points of view there are between therapists of different orientations, they attempt to achieve the same type of relationship with the client in therapy as judged by other therapists. As McNair and Lorr (1962, p. 428) sum it up, "there was little indication...(different types of)...therapists reacted differently with their patients."

Client Ratings of Counselor

Bown's (1954) early and continued interest in the relevance of client perceptions of the client-counselor relationship has indicated that clients' perceptions more accurately distinguished between the successful and unsuccessful cases than did those of the therapists.

Two recent studies by Van der Veen (1961a, 1961b) offer a different and perhaps more promising approach to the investigations of the counseling relationship. The author uses the Barrett-Lennard Relationship Inventory (BLRI) to determine how the client perceives the relationship as expressed in terms of empathy, unconditioned and positive regard, and genuineness. A positive relationship was found between BLRI scores and client movement in therapy. At the same time, no relationship was found between the clients' perception of relationship conditions and that of five psychologist judges' perception of the relationship.

The general approach in studies on the client-counselor interaction has been to estimate the relationship by the use of judges outside the counseling situation who rate the relationship which is present. The nature of the ideal therapeutic relationship has been well established, but the method of obtaining an indication of its presence has not been successful (Fiedler, 1950a; Parloff, 1961). Furthermore, the relevance of the relationship concept to therapy has been seriously questioned (Gonyea, 1962; Eaton, 1959; Lesser, 1961). The method of obtaining relationship ratings from the clients in therapy has met with a greater degree of success (Van der Veen, 1961a, 1961b).

In considering the fundamental nature of the counseling relationship to counseling theories, information concerning the development of the former is necessary to clarify some of the currently conflicting findings of research. One can argue that it is premature to discount the relevancy of the concept because previous methodology has proved to be inadequate in capturing the elusive quality or quantity of the client-counselor interaction.

Importance of Initial Interview

Investigations have rated counseling interviews over several sessions in an effort to quantify the counselor-client relationship. Although the dimensions on which the judges based their ratings may be ample in describing the relationship, the time factor may serve to confound the results. The assumption has been that the relationship will gain strength over time, but this has not been successfully established.

Reinterpretation of the results could indicate that the counselor-client relationship is established in the first few minutes of an initial counseling session and only becomes manifest to judges after several sessions.

It is plausible that an "experienced" counselor gives a particular client what he "needs" in these first few minutes and is not particularly bothered about the theoretical position or style of counseling which he (the counselor) may profess. The first few minutes may be crucial in the eventual successful outcome. This would account for "experience" being positively related to outcome. The ratings of responses in later sessions would indicate a good counseling relationship. An "inexperienced" counselor may miss the importance of the first few minutes either through personal concerns or employing a style or technique, which he has adopted, from the beginning. As ratings are made in later sessions, the counselor has achieved some comfort; and it would appear that the relationship has gained strength. Such a conclusion, however, could be a misjudgment. In fact, a "dependence-nurturing" relationship found by Eaton (1959), Lesser (1961), and Steiper and Wiener (1959), could be developing which would result in poor outcome.

The Problem

The problem, then, is to determine the counselee's perceptions of the counselor's helpfulness and understanding and the willingness of the counselee to relate to the counselor. For purposes of this research, it is assumed that counselees do make distinctions between approaches and techniques in the first few minutes of an initial counseling session.

The expressed preference of counselees for particular theoretical approaches to counseling may be related to particular types of intellectual or cognitive functioning. Previously cited studies have indicated that the mental abilities of counselees is related to successful outcome. Other studies such as Betz and Whitehorn (1956) and Whitehorn and Betz (1954) (1960) have indicated that certain attitudes in counselors have desirable effects on outcome when used with certain types of counselees. It would seem plausible that individuals with varying abilities or styles in solving problems would respond favorably to certain techniques or approaches in counseling while tending to reject others.

The Counseling Process

In approaching this aspect of the problem, counseling is conceptualized as a process whereby the counselee not only gathers but learns to use effectively available information in the solution of problems. Though there has been some hesitance on the part of theorists to refer to counseling as the "gaining of information," it has been implicit all along. Counseling has been referred to as "communication interaction" between the client and counselor (Bordin, 1955). Shaffer and Shoben (1956) defined counseling as a "situation where the client can learn new patterns of response." Rogers (1951), through the process of "reflection of feeling," is calling the client's attention to relevant effective information the counselor has picked out of the client's expressions.

There appear to be two relevant dimensions using this conceptualization of the counseling process. First, individuals differ in the amount of information they find necessary (demand) in order to solve similar problems. Second, individual differences exist in the amount of success in problem solving when using the same amounts of information. Plotting the two dimensions orthogonally, four gross categories result: high information demand-low problem solving success; low information demand-low problem solving success; high information demand-high problem solving success; and low information demand-high problem solving success.

Research by Westcott and others, cited later, indicates the differences in behavior patterns of the groups. The question posed here is, "Do individuals using different amounts of information from that available and varying in success of solution to problems prefer one approach or technique in counseling over another approach?" Are counselees of certain types more willing to relate to counselors employing a certain approach in preference to counselors employing other approaches particularly in the initial sessions when, hopefully, the relationship is being established?

Counseling Adolescents

Specifically related to adolescence, and in addition to the above aspects of the problem, are the difficulties encountered in counseling young people. The adolescent has long been noted for his erratic, confused, and somewhat rebellious nature. There has been no research published relating the changes that occur in adolescent development to counseling theory or practice.

Theories of intellectual functioning and development such as that of Inhelder and Piaget (1958) indicate a radical change in the kind of mental functioning existing during adolescence. Developmental studies of self concept have shown extreme changes occurring over the period of adolescence, both of the ideal self and the ideal models (Mussen and Jones, 1957). Studies of adolescents' perceptions of adult roles, such as that of Hemby (1965), have indicated an extensive change during adolescence.

The problem of counseling with these young people is ever present, and the question of how to deal most effectively with the problem has not been approached. The question remains, "Do the changes in attitudes, values, role perceptions, and self concepts lead to differences in preferences for counselor style or technique?" More specifically, what is the relationship of differences in age, sex, and cognitive styles to preferences for counseling techniques?

Summary

Results of studies concerning the nature of the counseling relationship are unclear; however, defining the relationship in terms of counselee perceptions appears most successful. How or when the relationship is established between the counselor and client is not known, and interpretation of the relevant research indicates that it can occur in the first few minutes of the initial interview.

Cognitive functioning of certain types is related to successful counseling outcome. When counseling is defined as the process by which the counselee gathers and learns to use available information in problem solving, specific dimensions of intellectual functioning become relevant, especially information demand and problem solving success. These two dimensions have been related to personality types which indicate the probability of varied responses to counseling style.

Theories and results of studies of adolescence have shown radical changes in attitudes, role perceptions, and self concept occurring during this period, yet no research has been performed indicating a specific preference or change in preference to counseling style by adolescent counselees. Difficulties encountered in counseling with this age group indicate a need to determine the counseling approach or approaches which would augment the establishing of a sound counseling relationship with this group. A step in this direction would be accomplished by determining preferences at different age levels within the adolescent period of development.

CHAPTER II

Relevant Research

This chapter contains references to research in counseling which deal with the theoretical foundation and instrumentation of the present study. Specific formulation of hypotheses is drawn from the references cited. The first part of this chapter deals with the definition of counseling approaches and counseling "leads." Previous methodology in research concerning the counseling relationship provides support for the use of such definitions of approaches or styles as representative of particular theoretical orientations.

Counselor Approach

Snyder (1945) developed classification categories for counselor responses based on the degree of permissiveness present. He employed simple acceptance, restatement of content or problem, and clarification or recognittion of feeling. Seeman (1948) focused on content of the response rather than counselor intent. In a later study (1949) he used Snyder's categories.

Sherman (1945) also focused on the content of counselor responses as a basis for structuring them into "techniques of leading," She listed the following categories: Silence, Acceptance, Restatement, Clarification, Summary Clarification, Approval, Tentative Analysis, Interpretation, Urging, Depth Interpretation, and Rejection and Assurance. Davis and Robinson (1949) defined leading techniques as clarification, interpretation, tentative analysis, and urging acceptance of advice.

Danskin (1955) used nine categories of counselor roles. He listed Participating, Diagnosing, Listening, Socializing, Reflective, Advising, Supporting, Informing, and Information Gathering. According to Morse (1956) this suggests that the kind of role assumed by the counselor is related to the counselor's orientation and approach. In a study of verbal expression of counselors representing three "schools," Morse (1956) found considerable stereotyping of responses corresponding to different counseling orientations. Relating this to the present research, the attempt is to discover the relationship between preferences by adolescents for particular counseling orientations (approaches) and the cognitive styles of those adolescents.

Buchheimer and Balogh (1961) suggested that counselors be trained in the use of different types of counseling leads. Further, the above authors discussed counselor role in the counselor-client relationship in terms of Receiving, Accepting, Understanding, Searching, Clarifying, Explaining, Supporting, Advising, Predicting, Interpreting, Investigating and Direct Questioning. Robinson (1950) listed several similar techniques: Silence, Acceptance, Clarification, Approval, General Leads, Tentative Analysis, Interpretation, Unrelated Topic, Assurance and Urging.

The duplication of types or kinds of counselor responses is readily seen in both the operational definitions which undergird the research and in the theoretical literature. In fact, part of the confusion in the research in this area may be due to overlapping of concepts or use of definitions that do not adequately discriminate one type of response from another. For example, is there any difference between approval and assurance found in Robinson (1950)? In Danskin (1955) it seems probable that "socializing" could also be "supporting."

Focus on Initial Interview

Overall and Aronson (1963) found that the patient's evaluation of the first interview in counseling was a better predictor of return to psychotherapy than the discrepancy between the patient's expectations and his therapist's perception of the interview. White, Fichtenbaum, and Dollard (1964) used a model in which judges rated and scored protocols of initial interviews to predict return of counselees. The results were highly significant and offered evidence that the initial session may be the key to the development of an effective counseling relationship.

Problem Solving Behavior

Logically, subjects who use different amounts of information and vary in the effectiveness with which it is used may have different expectations and preferences of approach in a counseling situation. This assumption is supported by findings in studies (Westcott 1960a, 1962a, 1962b) concerned with personality characteristics often associated with certain problem solving behavior. Thus, Westcott (1962a, p. 21) concluded:

> ...That there are significant differences in the ways in which these groups of individuals, identified by their problem-solving tactics and success, view their world and their relation to it. The successful intuitive thinkers are unconventional, affectively involved, confident and comfortable; the wild guessers are unconventional, affectively involved, but desperate and anxious; The steady successful problem solvers are cautious, orderly and confident, but can consider the possibility of behaving somewhat more erratically; the careful but unsuccessful problem solvers are cautious and compliant but defensive and moralistic about themselves and the world.

The counseling situation or relationship is often represented as an ideal which, if achieved should be beneficial to every client, regardless of his problem or personal make-up. The basic premise of the present study, however, is that the preference for certain types of counseling approaches will be different, for example, for the "successful intuitive thinkers" than the preference of the "careful but unsuccessful problem solvers."

Westcott Scale

Based on the above rationale, this instrument was chosen because of its particular relevance in determining the way in which subjects tend to handle information in problem solving. In view of the stable characteristic of this dimension, one can assume that the subject will tend to "handle" information in the counseling situation which he is rating much as he would in any problem solving situation.

The Westcott Scale is a series of 15 items (problems to solve) which are presented to the subject. Information is available in small quantities referred to as clues. The subject may give an immediate answer to the problem at hand or use some or all of the clues.

The studies by Westcott (1960a, 1960b) and Westcott and Ranzoni (1962) support this assumption in that subjects appeared to possess personality characteristics describing behavior similar to that observed on the Westcott Scale. Westcott (1962, p. 7) stated:

> Without attempting to integrate these findings yet, let me simply say that it seems evident that people can operate in a very successful fashion, making complex discriminations and important shifts in behavior without awareness of what they are doing or the fact that change has taken place. It appears that there are, at least in some cases, changes in affect to accompany these changes in overt behavior, and that the entire operation can go on without any awareness by the subject.

Westcott (1960a, 1961) and Westcott and Ranzoni (1962) demonstrated that there are individual differences on the two scored dimensions of this instrument, namely the amount of information used from that available and success in solution of the problems. Subjects in these studies were categorized into four groups: Low demand-high success (Group 1), Low demand-low success

(Group 2), High demand-high success (Group 3) and High demand-low success (Group 4).

Westcott (1962b, p. 9) stated:

> ...I inquired concerning what differences there might be among the individuals representing the four extreme types of problem solving performance: (1) those who require little information and are consistently successful--the true intuitive thinkers; (2) those who require significantly more information than the average, but are also significantly more successful--the steady, hard working problem solvers, (3) the individuals who demand a great deal of information and are unable to solve the problems--individuals possibly blocked, or unduly rigid, or confused; (4) finally, the subjects who ask for little information and then leap to failure--persons who are unsuccessful intuiters, possibly desperate, or committed to the long shot at whatever cost.

With reference to personality characteristics of the types, Westcott (1962a, p. 26) said:

> A self description of each group then might be as follows: Group 1 members see themselves as alert, quick, confident, foresighted, informal, resourceful, spontaneous, and independent. Members of Group 2 see themselves as being alert, quick, cynical, and headstrong. Group 3 members see themselves as cautious, kind, modest, confident, foresighted, informal, resourceful and spontaneous. Group 4 is distinguished as being cautious, kind, modest, and lacking in self-confidence, while not at all cynical, sharpwitted, demanding, or headstrong.

Westcott (1962a) reported relatively modest split-half reliability coefficients for seven experimental samples ranging from .36 to .72 for Problem-solving success scores and .70 to .91 for Information Demand Scores. They may be considered acceptable in view of the fact that these were homogeneous samples of college students, which would reduce the size of the correlations. This point, however, led to further work aimed at developing internal consistency of the measure and thus greater reliability. Pierce-Jones (1964) performed item analysis studies from large numbers of responses and reduced the length of the scale from 20 to 15 items. The revised scales when scored for ID and PSS produced normally distributed scores with more adequate reliability coefficients of .75 to .78 respectively.

The description of the widely varying personality characteristics possessed by different Westcott types, supports the hypothesis that individuals of the different types would, in the event of participation in counseling, come to counseling with very different needs. There would be no reason to suppose that all types would approach the counseling situation with the same expectations or needs in the form of relationship with the counselor or the same preference for counselor approach.

Background of Counselor Rating Form

Barrett-lennard (1962, p. 2) developed the counseling Relationship Questionnaire while assuming:

> ...a basic general postulate of the present investigation is that the client's experience of his therapist's response is the primary focus of therapeutic influence in their relationship.

Furthermore, (p. 2), he pointed out:

> ...It follows from this that the relationship experienced by the client (rather than by the therapist) will be most crucially related to outcome of therapy.

In addition (p. 2), he wrote:

> ...it would seem that his own (the client's) report...would be the most direct and reliable evidence we could get of his actual experience.

This provided the theoretical foundation for the three dimensions of the Counselor Rating Form

(Appendix A) used in the present study.

The Relationship Questionnaire was based on the original Bown (1954) Relationship Q-Sort and contained both negative and positive responses. Barrett-Lennard (1962 p. 3) used content validity in support of this scale "as in other research where variables are given operational form for the first time, validation at this level is necessarily indirect."

Making use of the Barrett-Lennard findings, McCreary (1962) developed the Reliability Scale which Steph (1963) used as a basis for the Wisconsin Relationship Orientation Scale (WROS). In its third revision, Steph used five levels of "willingness to relate:"

> Level 1: I would attempt to avoid any kind of interaction or relationship with this person.
>
> Level 2: If no one else were available, I might consult this person for specific information of a factual, e.g., educational or vocational nature, but I would avoid any personal exposure.
>
> Level 3: I would be willing to talk with this person about factual, e.g.,

education or vocational concerns, and some of the personal meanings connected with these.

Level 4: I would be willing to talk with this person about many of my personal concerns.

Level 5: I have the feeling that I could probably talk with this person about almost anything.

Steph used judges who rated counselors on the above dimensions and found considerable variability in the way his judges rated the counselors. It seemed that, without training, the psychologist judges focused on the different aspects of the counselor that were important to their individual willingness to relate to the counselor. By holding counseling orientation constant, interjudge reliability estimates were attained in the range .83 to .97. When obtained across all judges, the correlations fell into a range of .60 to .70.

The WROS was utilized in the pilot study, reported later in this chapter, for the proposed research with ample success. The results of the pilot study indicated that subjects untrained in psychology or judging do focus on different aspects of counselors and thus are willing to relate to them at different levels.

Development of Counselor Rating Forms

The dimensions of the counseling relationship studied in the present research are defined by the counselor rating form (Appendix A). This instrument is a simply-designed form in which the subjects are asked for a rating of five counselors, using different counseling approaches, on three principal dimensions. The counselee is asked to rate each counselor, portraying a different approach, on:

1. the degree to which the counselor is helpful in solving the problem,
2. the degree to which the counselor understands the problem, and
3. the degree to which the subject would feel free to discuss his problems with the counselor.

Item number three contains Steph's five levels of "willingness to relate" previously mentioned.

From the pilot study data cited later in this chapter, item intercorrelations were obtained. Across forty subjects item-to-item correlations for each tape rating were .50 or higher, and item-to-total ratings were .80 or higher. Varimax factor procedures were applied to the matrix. This, in turn, resulted in the generation of five factors, each accounting for an approximately equal percentage of the total variance and unequivocally corresponding to the five counselor approaches. The internal consistency of the rating to be secured from the film strips used in the present study were expected to be as great or greater than that obtained from the audio tapes used in the pilot study.

Pilot Study of Counselor Approaches

The principal piece of related research is the pilot study, already underaken and complete (but not yet reported) at the University of Texas. The pilot study employed a model similar to that proposed here to determine if high school students would express their preferences for particular counselor approaches. More specifically, the question explored was whether or not expressed preferences for various counselor approaches would be related to cognitive styles as defined by Westcott's Information Demand and Problem Solving Success Scale.

Procedures of Pilot Study

In the pilot study, audio tapes were produced in which male counselee responses were identical in scripts of five four-minute initial counseling sessions. Each of the five counselor approaches was represented by appropriate responses from the scripts presented by a single counselor.

A sample of 40 male high school seniors listened to the tapes in groups of five subjects so that the approaches could be presented in a systematically varied order. The subjects rated the counselor after each session. When they had listened to and rated the approaches, all subjects were given the revised Westcott Scale.

The two dimensions of the Westcott Scale, Information Demand (ID) and Problem Solving Success (PSS) were split at the medians which divided the sample into four groups: Low ID-High PSS, Low ID-Low PSS, High ID-Low PSS, and High ID-High PSS.

Development of Scripts Representing Counselor Approaches

For purposes of the pilot study, the following procedures were employed, which resulted in the development of five scripts representing distinct counseling approaches. Construction of the scripts used in the pilot study involved two departmental staff members who worked separately with a common counselee problem. Appropriate counselor responses were originated for each of several approaches. Agreement was reached, and the scripts were revised. The scripts were then edited by a counseling supervisor to increase the representativeness of each script for each approach. Finally, the scripts were submitted to three experienced counselors who were each asked to rate each counselor response on each script as to the degree it was clearly in keeping with the approach designated. Categories were discarded when counselor responses in these categories could not be unequivocally discriminated by expert judges.

The following approaches were derived from the above procedures:

(1) Advice Giving Approach: Advice, as conceptualized here, is the counselor's suggestion of a specific action of how to solve the problem. As Williamson (1950, p. 233) has pointed out, "...the counselor is ready to advise with the student as to a program of action..." There is some question in the literature as to the "purity" of this approach. Some think that it may be supporting to some degree.

(2) Questioning Approach: The counselor poses a question to the client prior to each client response. This type of approach resembles that suggested for the initial interview by Fromm-Reichmann (1950).

(3) Reflection of Feeling Approach: The

counselor responds with feeling appropriate to the content of client responses. This approach is consistent with that proposed by Rogers (1962).

(4) Supporting Approach: The counselor in this approach attempts to convey to the client that the client has "what it takes" to work the problem out, and that, with a little help, everything will come out all right.

(5) Information Giving Approach: The counselor provides information of a specific nature to the counselee which he (the counselor) considers relevant to the problem at hand (Michael and Meyerson, 1962).

In addition, a "blind sort" was also performed by a different set of three judges to assure agreement and "purity of approach." Definitions of each of the five approaches elicited from the previous judging were provided, and each judge was asked to sort each of the counselor responses of all five approaches into the type it represented. This sort was made without any contextual aids or knowledge of the nature of the research. All three judges achieved a 100% perfect sort. That is, each of the three judges was able to identify all of the counselor responses as belonging to a particular, defined counseling approach.

Results of Pilot Study

The results of the pilot study indicated that the high school seniors tested did have clear preferences for particular counselor approaches as shown by their rating of the counselor on the tape as helpful and as understanding, and in terms of the degree to which they would relate to the counselor.

Low ID-High PSS individuals tended to prefer Information Giving and Supporting approaches and significantly (p=.05) rejected the Reflection of Feeling approach. There was also a tendency to reject Advising and Questioning approaches.

The Low ID-Low PSS group appeared to prefer the Advising and Supporting approaches. Subjects in this group insignificantly tended to reject

Questioning, Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving approaches.

High ID-High PSS subjects tended to prefer the Advising and Supporting approaches and significantly rejected ($p=.05$) Reflection of Feeling. This group also tended to reject Questioning and Information Giving approaches.

High ID-Low PSS subjects appeared to accept all approaches equally except the Reflection of Feeling approach which was rejected insignificantly. It should be pointed out that there was extreme variation in the rating of the Reflection of Feeling approach by this group. This could have resulted from the discomfort caused by the approach, or this group may be unable to discriminate among counselor approaches.

Discussion of Results of Pilot Study

Two of the results of the pilot study were not those one might be led to expect logically. For example, one would not expect the Low ID-High PSS subjects to prefer the Information Giving approach over the other approaches.

Possible explanations of this result could lie in the brevity of the initial interview or in the small sample of subjects. The small amount of information given in the brief episode may have been sufficient for, and valued by, this Low ID-High PSS group. It is also recognized that while the pilot study may provide directional leads for hypotheses, the limited sample involved demands replication of the study with larger populations.

It is also possible that each of the five approaches may have a psychological meaning different from the logical implications of the Westcott categories. That is, the High ID-High PSS subject may have perceived the Information Giving approach as an imposition or meddling in his life by self-sure, adult authority, rather than information giving in a purely quantitative sense. Also, it is possible that this group does not view the Information Giving approach as providing the structure needed to organize information for use in problem solving. The brevity of the initial interview may not have provided a sufficient amount of information for the High ID-Low PSS group.

The results of the pilot study indicated some subjects will rate two or more counseling approaches at the same level on all three items of the Counselor Rating Form. For this reason, in these instances, it is not possible to determine the most preferred approach.

Varimax factoring procedures of the Counselor Rating Form (cited earlier in this chapter) indicated that the subjects do perceive the counselor approaches as separate and distinct. The alternate explanation arises that subjects may prefer more than one approach. In addition, the Counselor Rating Form may not be sensitive enough to detect a single, preferred approach.

Although no females were included in the pilot study sample, it has begun to be realized that because of differences in life patterns of women as contrasted with men, the counseling of girls and women may require different approaches than those employed successfully with men. Havighurst (1965 p. 153) gives two major reasons for this recommended differentiation in counseling: (1) the pathways to adulthood for girls are different from those for boys; (2) the problem of identity achievement for girls is different from that for boys. Thus, if different counseling procedures are needed, then the female preferences for the defined approaches in this study should vary in some ways from those of the males.

Hypotheses

The following hypotheses are based on the results of the pilot study and the findings of Westcott concerning cognitive style and related personality characteristics. Hypothesis I: Variations in preference for counseling approaches by subjects are related to typical cognitive styles of subjects as defined by Information Demand and Problem Solving Success.

A. Male Subjects

1. Low ID-High PSS subjects will tend to rate the Information Giving approach highest.

This hypothesis was based on the findings of the pilot study previously reported in this chapter. Although this group does not "ask for" a large amount of information to solve problems or to make decisions; nevertheless, they appear to operate on an information gathering basis. That is, while they do not need much information, they appear to perceive the Information Giving approach as more helpful than the other counselor approaches.

Members of this group appear able to apply their own structure to any problematical situation or issue. As Westcott described them (1962a, p. 27), "the causes and concerns which capture their imagination appear to be sweepingly abstract issues," and "they are willing and able to create" new methods of solution. One would expect that they would tend to resist questioning as an irrelevant waste of time, refuse support as not necessary, and refuse advising because they are able and willing to structure their own decisions. Perhaps Reflection of Feeling does not provide the kind of information this group employs in problem solving.

2. Low ID-Low PSS subjects will tend to prefer the Advising approach. This second group appears to be, according to Westcott (1962a, p. 28), "fearful in crises and apparently accept challenges and risks more with grim desperation than with confident zest." In addition, "they do not recognize changes of great significance in themselves in spite of the fact that they feel themselves influenced by others." In other words, they will accept advice to reduce anxiety; but their behavior is externally directed, and, thus, no internalized changes occur. They find it more comfortable to follow the advice of others in order to accomplish their goals, but they do not "own" the behavior in the event of error.

The concept of support implies decision-making on the part of the counselee which is to be supported by the counselor. This group, as stated previously, tends to refuse to make decisions for which they will be responsible. Thus, one would expect them to reject the Supporting approach. At the same time, Questioning, Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving approaches would be rejected because this group fails to connect the outcome of these approaches with the solution to the problem at hand.

3. High ID-High PSS males will tend to rate the supporting approach highest. This group is described by Westcott (1962a, p. 28) as "cautious, conservative and compliant." Further, they are "well socialized," but can be very involved in things; however, these things generally come from outside themselves. This group tends to look for external support of feedback, and the certainties of life come from this support. There is reason to suppose that they would feel more comfortable in a counseling situation where the counselor provides the feedback.

Although this group gathers a great deal of information, they may not be able to organize this mass of data easily enough to feel comfortable with decisions based on such data. Nor does Questioning or Reflection of Feeling provide the contextual organization which they appear to seek. Because this group is able to make its own decisions under certain conditions, they would tend to prefer the Supporting approach over the Advising approach. That is, the Advising approach does not allow them to make their own decisions. The Supporting approach, however, may be perceived as both a source of external feedback and a source of organizing and structuring of information.

4. High ID--Low PSS males will tend to accept all approaches equally. This hypothesis was based on the findings of the pilot study previously cited in this chapter. The aforementioned pilot study indicated that these subjects either did not perceive differences among the various counselor approaches or valued all approaches equally.

This group is described as inflexible and anxious. According to Westcott (1962a, p. 28), they "live in a world where everything is risky at best, and one always works to minimize risk." It is as if they are saying, "Any counselor will do as long as he helps reduce the risk of anxiety." That is, the counselor himself, regardless of approach, is perceived as a potential anxiety-reducing agent.

B. Female Subjects

Because female subjects were not used in the pilot study, there was no evidence from that source, even tentative in nature, to give directional form to the hypotheses for female subjects. In order to maintain a form consistent with that used for male subjects, directional hypotheses are stated for the female subjects.

1. Low ID-High PSS females will tend to rate Reflection of Feeling highest. The females seem more likely to prefer an approach based on reflection of feelings and emotions because it is more socially acceptable for the female to respond emotionally to emotional content.

Because of the self confidence reported by this group in Westcott's sample, one might expect them to reject the Advising, Questioning, Information Giving and Supporting approaches. At the same time, their "comfortable, affective involvement" possibly would enable them to respond to the feeling approach with feeling responses.

2. Low ID-Low PSS females will tend to prefer advising, and rate it higher than male subjects of the same group. Because of developmental sex role differences, females receive more and are accustomed to more advice from parents and significant others than males. Thus, female individuals of this group will tend to be more willing than males to accept the advice of others, and rate the approach higher than males.

Using the same rationale as presented for male subjects of this group, the females will accept advice to reduce anxiety. They would tend to reject the Supporting approach because of the decisions implied by this approach. Other approaches would be rejected because of failure by this group to see the relevance of the approaches to the solution of the problem.

3. High ID-High PSS females will tend to prefer the Supporting Approach and will probably rate it higher than male subjects of the same group. Although both males and females of this group are described as "conforming," one might expect the females, in general, to be more conforming than the males. Crutchfield (1962) reported that females in his studies consistently earned higher conformity scores than did males.

Conformity, by its very nature, requires feedback. That is, it is difficult for one to assess the degree and success of conforming to a social structure without external support and feedback. Thus, one would expect the females of this group to prefer the counseling approach which they perceive as providing the greatest amount of feedback; that is, the Supporting approach.

Although this group seeks a large amount of information in solving problems, it is possible that the Information Giving approach does not provide the type of information sought by this group of females. That is, this group of females may not be seeking unstructured, unorganized data as represented by Information Giving. The Information Giving approach may not be perceived as providing the support and feedback needed to assess the success of their conformity to existing social structures. Thus, one might expect them to tend to reject the Information Giving approach. Because the High ID-High PSS group may not be able to organize a mass of data easily enough to feel comfortable with decisions based on such data, they may reject Questioning and Reflection of Feeling as lacking the contextual organization which they appear to seek At the same time, because this group is able to make its own decisions under certain conditions, they will probably prefer the Supporting approach over the Advising approach. That is, the Advising approach does not allow them to make their own decisions.

4. High ID-Low PSS females will tend to rate all approaches equally, but, at the same time higher than the mean rating of each group of each approach. In other words, they may tend to be more accepting of all approaches than the other groups.

As previously noted, this group is described as inflexible and anxious. They may perceive the counselor himself, regardless of approach, as a potential anxiety-reducing agent. Considering this group's anxiety, together with the female's general tendency toward socially acceptable dependence and conformity, High ID-Low PSS females may tend to rate all approaches higher than all other males and all other female groups. It may be that this female group, like the corresponding male group, either does not perceive differences among the various counselor approaches or values all approaches equally.

Age Differences

A variety of studies have indicated developmental changes in cognitive functioning of adolescents. Inhelder and Piaget (1958) have theorized a gradual transition from concrete thinking to formal thought or abstraction and generalization. This theory has particular relevance for the proposed study in that the change in the intellectual functioning should change the preference of counselees

2

for or response to a particular type of approach by the counselor.

Wilson (1963) found the adolescent increasingly able to integrate conflicting information with increase in age. The younger subjects manifested a "second-hand" structure of attitudes based on parental attitudes Though not directly related to counseling, Wilson's data implies developmental changes in cognitive capacities, in addition to characteristic differences between sexes.

Studies by Jones and Bayley (1950), Jones (1958) and Mussen and Jones (1957) all indicated profound changes, related to physical development, occurring during adolescence. Differences between early and late maturing adolescents apparently produce lasting differences in perceptions of self, although the physical differences disappear. In a recent study, Hemby (1965) found dramatic changes among adolescents from Grade Nine to Grade Twelve in the way they perceived their adult roles in relation to the opposite sex. How one sees the world and himself in it should certainly affect his expectations of counseling.

The variation in development of cognitive functioning, attitudes, self concepts, and adult role perceptions of adolescents adds to the problem of establishing a sound counseling relationship. Different age groups are not likely to perceive the same approach in the same manner. One can infer from Wilson's study, cited above, that younger adolescents tend to look to older persons as sources for providing structure. A ninth-grade counselee, for example, might wish to have a great deal more structure or direction in the solution of his problems than would a senior in high school. Thus, Hypothesis II is evolved: ninth-grade subjects will tend to rate the Advising or Supporting approach higher than twelfth-grade subjects.

The Information Giving and Questioning approaches, as defined here, may not provide the structure and organization which appears to be sought by younger adolescents. Reflection of Feeling, also, does not supply the structure and organization sought by younger adolescents. By definition, the client has the responsibility for supplying structure in the Reflection of Feeling approach. Thus, one would expect the ninth-grade subjects to prefer the more organized and structured Advising and Supporting approaches over the other less structured approaches.

CHAPTER III

Procedures

This chapter contains a description of the procedures employed in production of the scripts and films, in presentation of the films, in the scoring of instruments, and in the statistical tests applied to the data collected. The reader will note in this chapter that the procedures followed in developing the scripts for this research are the same as those which were successfully employed in the previously cited pilot study. The use of multiple counselors in varied orders randomized the effects of counselor differences. The randomized presentation of both counselors and counseling approaches controlled for any presentation order effects.

Script Production

Two pre-doctoral counselors working together developed the dialogue of a male counselee expressing a common-place problem involving study habits, educational decision, and mild parent-adolescent conflict. The two counselors, working independently, developed counselor responses in keeping with the approach definitions proposed for this study. The two scripts were then revised and condensed into one set of scripts containing five initial counseling approaches to identical counselee responses. The female counselee responses were almost identical with the male responses, modified only when it was necessary to reflect female activities.

The scripts were then submitted to an experienced counseling supervisor for revision and reworking for smoothness and naturalness of language. The scripts were further revised and submitted to another experienced counselor for additional suggestions. This led to further refinement. The resulting scripts for each of the five counseling approaches portrayed an initial counseling session of approximately three minutes in length.

In addition to the above research scripts, two "mixed approach" scripts using a male and female counselee respectively were developed dealing with an entirely different counselee problem. Counselor responses were varied in approach or type and were entirely different from those used in the research scripts. These scripts were used for instruction and practice rating by subjects during the actual data gathering procedures.

Approach Sort

In order to obtain some indication of the "cleanness" of each counseling approach script, the following procedures were employed. Each counselor response from each of the five counseling approaches was placed on a slip of paper. The slips were then mixed thoroughly. Three experienced counselors, each with a Doctor of Philosophy degree and of different backgrounds (Ohio State University, University of Wisconsin, and University of Texas), all unfamiliar with the nature and design of the proposed research, were given the definitions of the counseling approaches cited in Chapter II. Each judge was instructed to draw a counselor response slip and place it with the counselor approach definition which he felt was reflected by the response. The accuracy with which the judges placed the individual counselor responses into the original categories is the index of the clarity of portrayal by the responses of each counseling approach. The results of these procedures are shown in Table 1. Judge A placed 84% of the counselor responses in the correct categories. Judge B placed 96% in the correct approach categories; and Judge C, 100%. It should be noted that this sort was accomplished by the judges without the aid of any contextual clues.

Response Rating

After completing the response sort described above, each of the same three counselor judges was provided a complete script of each approach and asked to rate, on a five point scale, each counselor response in terms of the degree to which the response reflected the approach it was intended

Table 1

Judges' Errors in Sorting Counselor

Responses without Context

	Counseling Approach					Total	
Response #	Adv.	Ques.	Ref.	Supp.	Info.	Error	% Error
1*							
2							
3							
4					A	1	
5	A			A		2	
6				B	A	2	
7	A		A			2	
8							
9					B	1	
10	A			A		2	
11							
12*							
	3	0	1	3	3	10	6.3%
Judge A	3	0	1	2	2	8	16.0%
Judge B	0	0	0	1	1	2	4.0%
Judge C	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0%

*Introductory and concluding remarks omitted in sorting.

to portray. The results of the above ratings are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

This procedure was employed as an additional test to determine if there were any single responses which were not in keeping with a particular approach as perceived by multiple judges even if it could be categorized correctly. The results of this procedure indicated that all three judges were consistent in their ratings, although Judge C rated all the items consistently lower than Judges A and B. Even though Judge C rated all the responses lower than Judges A and B, Judge C obtained a 100% perfect sort in the aforementioned approach sort.

Film Production

Counselors

Five post-doctoral, male counselors were selected from the staff of the University of Texas. As much as possible, care was taken to select those of different orientations and training background. Two received all of their training

Table 2

Ratings of Judges of Counselor Responses as to the Degree the Responses are in Keeping with Approaches Defined

Res-ponse	Judge A					Judge B					Judge C				
#	Ref	Adv	Ques	Info	Sup	Ref	Adv	Ques	Info	Sup	Ref	Adv	Ques	Info	Sup
2	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	5	3	5	4	3	5	3	3
3	4	5	5	5	5	3	5	5	4	5	3	4	4	3	3
4	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	3	4	5	3	4	3	4	4
5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	4	3	4	3	3	3
6	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
7	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	3	5	4	4	3	4	4
8	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	4	5	5	5	4	2	3	4
9	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	3	4	3	4
10	5	5	5	4	5	5	4	5	4	4	3	3	4	3	4
11	5	5	5	5	5	5	4	5	4	5	4	3	4	3	4
Means	4.9	5.0	5.0	4.8	5.0	4.6	4.3	4.7	4.0	4.7	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.2	3.6

Table 3

Mean of Judges Ratings of Each Response

Response #	Ref.	Adv.	Ques.	Info.	Supp.
2	4.33	3.66	5.00	3.66	4.33
3	3.33	4.66	4.66	4.00	4.33
4	4.33	4.66	3.66	4.33	4.66
5	4.00	4.66	4.33	4.00	4.00
6	4.66	4.00	4.33	3.66	4.00
7	4.66	4.66	4.33	4.00	4.66
8	5.00	4.66	3.66	4.33	4.66
9	4.66	4.33	4.66	4.33	4.66
10	4.33	4.00	4.66	3.66	4.33
11	4.66	4.00	4.66	4.00	4.66

at other institutions (University of Chicago, Ohio State University). One had a major portion of his work at a theological seminary. Two had the major portion of their training and academic work at the University of Texas, but in different departments (Psychology and Educational Psychology).

All five of the counselors used in the approach episodes and the one counselor used in the mixed approach episode were mature appearing and ranged in age from 32 to 44 years. All of the counselors had internships in approved counseling or clinical psychology programs with length of experience ranging from 2 to 20 years.

Counselees

One male and one female high school student were selected from a local high school other than those in which data were collected. Attention was given to the quality of voice and appearance in selection of the counselees, in order that they could pass for either ninth or twelfth-grade students. Both of the counselees had considerable training and experience in drama and assumed their roles readily and consistently. Neither had any unusual or detracting personal characteristics.

Photographic Equipment

Camera: The camera employed for film production was an Auricon "Pro-600 Special" camera head (self blimped), Model CM-77, with a zoom lens door. Additional features included a silenced geared footage counter, safety interlocked film flow, built-in electric heater with thermostat, Auricon Driv-o-matic film take up, and synchronous motor drive. The camera was specially equipped with 1200-foot capacity film magazines, model M-77-4, with adaptors for "laboratory pack" film on plastic cores.

Sound System: A galvanometer and optical system, model T-70-D, was installed in the camera for recording variable density (W.E. type) optical sound-track on film. The sound amplifying equipment used was an Auricon, model RA-31-AD7, optical sound-tract recording amplifier. This unit was equipped with inputs for microphone, phono, volumeindicator meter, and sound-track exposure meter. The microphone used was an Auricon, model E-6, "high fidelity" designed for use with the amplifying unit.

Lens: The camera was equipped with a Panzanar 100 Reflex Zoom L lens, F3.4-22, 25m - 100m, made by Berthiot.

Tape Recorder: As a safeguard, in the event of sound equipment failure, a Wollensak, model T-1500, magnetic tape recorder was in operation during all "takes." Since camera sound equipment was in order during film production, the tape recordings were not needed.

Teleprompter: A 20" by 24" ground glass screen with variable angle mirror was employed to pick up the projection from a Thermo Fax, model 66AG, over-head projector. In this manner the fan noise of the projector was removed from the room. Clear plastic overlays were prepared from typed copies of the scripts. These were used in projecting the copy onto the teleprompter. The counselor had a copy of his script present at all times. The teleprompter was placed so that when the counselor was looking at the prompter screen, it would appear on film that he was looking at the counselee.

Film: The film used in the production of the counseling sequences was Eastman TRI-X reversal film of type 7278, single perforation and B winding. In try-out "takes" it was found this type was sufficient to yield high quality films under natural lighting conditions.

Production Set: The room used in production was located in the Counseling Center of the University of Texas and is normally used as a counseling office. The room was 12' by 17' in size and was an inside office with no exterior openings. The ceiling was of an accoustical type. One long wall was fully draped. The other long wall was draped with sound blankets to reduce echo. Sound blankets were also used over the asphalt tile floor.

Filming Process

A total of fifty episodes were produced

with each of five different counselors producing five methodologically different episodes with a male client and five different episodes with a female client. That is, each of the five counselors portrayed each of the five approaches with a male client and each of the five approaches with a female client. Only one counselor was filmed during any one filming period. This enabled the counselor to "get to know" the counselees prior to actual filming and thus feel more at ease. The same two counselees were used in all filming.

Filming Order: The order in which the different approaches were filmed was randomly varied with each counselor. Thus, none of the approaches was filmed at the same ordered place with any of the counselors. By this procedure any practice effect due to filming order for each participating counselor was randomized. The male and female counselees were filmed consecutively, while the counselor used one approach. The order in which the male or female was filmed, however, was also varied randomly between approaches.

Practice Film: Two practice films (one with a male counselee and one with a female counselee) were produced employing another counselor portraying the "mixed approach" described above. These films were also of an initial counseling session and approximately three minutes in length. Although the counselees were the same in the "mixed approach" as those in the research films, a different or sixth counselor was used.

Orders of Sequences

The above procedures yielded films of five counselors each using five different counseling approaches with a male counselee and the same five counselors each using five counseling approaches with a female counselee. The original films were edited and ordered into 20 (10 male, 10 female) random variations of counselor and approach as shown in Table 4. The practice film appears first in each order. Each order, including practice film, was approximately 20 minutes in length. Two prints were

Table 4

Order of Counselors and Techniques in Which Film Sequences Were Shown

Order Number	Orders				
1	E4	A2	C5	D1	B3
2	D4	B2	A3	C1	E5
3	A5	D2	C3	E1	B4
4	C2	D5	B1	A4	E3
5	B5	E2	D3	A1	C4
6	A1	C2	E4	B5	D3
7	C4	E1	D5	B2	A3
8	B4	C1	E3	A5	D2
9	E2	A4	B3	D1	C5
10	D4	C3	E5	B1	A2

Counselors: A,B,C,D,E,

Techniques: 1,2,3,4,5

drawn from the originals to preserve the original and remove splices. The resulting prints were used in data collection.

Film Presentation

Sample

Samples of 100 twelfth-grade males, 98 twelfth-grade females, 100 ninth-grade males and 100 ninth-grade females were selected at random from a local population of students in the secondary schools of Austin, Texas (Table 5). The student bodies of the schools from which the samples were selected were composed of predominantly middle-class Anglo-Americans.

Film Viewing Procedures

Each of the ten film orders were viewed by 10 randomly selected subjects of the same sex and grade as the counselee in the film. In this manner, males viewed the film orders presenting a male being counseled, and females viewed the film orders of a female being counseled.

Instructions for viewing, rating, and

Table 5

Number of Subjects Classified by Grade and by Sex

N=398

	Male	Female	Totals
Ninth	100	100	200
Twelfth	100	98	198
Totals	200	198	398

ranking were given prior to the practice film, and the subjects were asked to put themselves in the place of the counselee. After the practice film was shown and rated, the subjects were again reminded to try to put themselves in the place of the counselee while viewing the films.

After each approach was viewed, the subjects were asked to rate the counselor using the counselor rating form provided (see Appendix A). The films were designed to give the subjects 15 seconds between approaches to make their ratings. After viewing all approaches and completing the rating forms, the subjects were asked to complete the ranking form (see Appendix A).

After the ratings and rankings were completed and collected, the subjects were asked to complete the Westcott Problem Solving Scale (see Appendix B). Subjects were permitted 20 minutes to complete this scale.

Scoring of Instruments

Counselor Rating Form

This instrument contains three items. The student was asked to rate each counselor as to his helpfulness, understanding of the counselee's problem, and degree to which the subject would be willing to relate with him. The items are rated on a five point scale. The item scores were summed to yield an approach preference score.

Counselor Ranking Form

This instrument contains the same three items as the rating form. The subjects were asked to place in rank order the counselors they prefer for each of the three items. A median rank score was obtained for each approach. Each approach was then ranked again based on the median ranking score. The final rank score was obtained from the final ranked order of the approaches.

The rating scale was scheduled to be completed by all of the subjects; but due to lack of time in the public school setting, the rank order data was excluded by some subjects. The resulting sample for rank order data was 195 ninth-grade subjects and 147 twelfth-grade subjects. The omission of rank order data occurred randomly, thus, no systematic effects should be present in the data.

Westcott Problem Solving Scale

The Westcott scale yielded two scores. The total number of correct responses is defined as Problem Solving Success. The Information Demand score is derived by summing the number of additional clues the subject desired for all fifteen items as indicated by erasures uncovering the clues.

Subjects' scores were sorted into four categories according to their performance on the two dimensions of the Westcott Scale as presented in Table 6. Problem Solving Success scores were split at the median, thus providing high and low success problem solvers. Information Demand scores were also split at the median, thus yielding a high demand and a low demand group. The resulting four types of subjects were: High ID-High PSS, Low ID-High PSS, High ID-Low PSS and Low ID-Low PSS.

Table 6

Number of Male and Female Subjects Classified by Information Demand and Problem Solving Success on Westcott Scale

N = 398

			P S S		
			Low	High	Totals
Information Demand	High	Males	58	42	100
		Females	48	51	99
	Low	Males	42	58	100
		Females	51	48	99
	Totals		199	199	398

The reliability estimate for the Problem Solving Success score of the Westcott Scale was obtained by correlating odd and even scores of the total sample and correcting by the Spearman-Brown formula. The resulting odd-even reliability coefficient was .79. The estimate for the Information Demand score was obtained by number of clues used on odd items and number of clues used on even items. The result was corrected by the Spearman-Brown formula for attenuation. The corrected odd-even coefficient was .81.

Statistical Procedures

Rating Scale Scores

For Hypothesis I.A.1, I.A.2, and I.A.3, analysis of variance was used to test for hypothesized differences among the rating scores for the five approaches. In the above, it was hypothesized that a particular group of males would rate one approach higher than the other approaches. A group-by-treatments design was used with one group (as specified in the hypothesis) and five treatments (five approaches). For Hypothesis I.A.4, a one-by-five-treatments F-test was employed which compared the ratings of the five approaches simultaneously. This hypothesis stated that High ID-Low PSS males would rate all approaches equally.

For testing Hypothesis I.B.1 and the first part of I.B.2, a one-group-by-five-treatments analysis of variance was used to test for differences in rating scores for the five approaches. It had been hypothesized that a particular group of females would rate one approach higher than the other approaches. The second part of I.B.2 hypothesized that the Low ID-Low PSS females would rate the Advising approach higher than Low ID-Low PSS males. To test this portion of the hypothesis, a single classification analysis of variance was used with two groups (males vs. females)-by-one-dependent variable (rating of Advising approach). The same statistical analysis used for Hypothesis I.B.2 above were used for Hypothesis I.B.3 to test whether High ID-High PSS females rated the Supporting highest and higher than males of the same group.

Hypothesis I.B.4 stated that High ID-Low PSS females would rate all approaches equally, but at the same time, higher than the mean rating of each group of each approach. Hypothesis I.B.4 was tested with a one-group-by-five-treatments design to determine differences within the group. In the hypothesis as stated, the null hypothesis assumed would not be rejected. To test the second part of the hypothesis, a two-groups (High ID-Low PSS females vs. all other subjects)-by-five-treatments design was used.

To test for differences between ninth and twelfth graders in rating the Advising and Supporting approaches as stated in Hypothesis II, a single classification analysis of variance with two groups (ninth vs. twelfth) by two independent variables (Ratings of Supporting and Advising approaches).

Rank Order Scores

The Chi-square statistic was employed as the general procedure for testing subject's preference for hypothesized approaches, expressed in rank order form. The hypothesis that subjects of a certain group would prefer Approach A to Approach B was interpreted as an hypothesis that the observed frequencies in a two-cell Chi-square table would depart from a 50-50 division (Guilford 1956, p. 237). One cell contained the number of subjects preferring Approach A to Approach B (ranking Approach A higher than Approach B) and the other cell of the table contained the number of subjects who did not prefer Approach A to Approach B or did not rank Approach A higher than Approach B.

The hypothesis that subjects of group A would rank a given approach higher than subjects of group B was tested using the median test (Guilford, 1956 p. 249). The rows of the two-by-two contingency table thus formed represented group A and group B; the columns represented subjects ranking the given approach above the grand median and subjects ranking the approach below the grand median.

In applying the Chi-square test of significance to both the two-by-two and two cell contingency tables, Yate's correction for continuity (Guilford 1956, p. 234) was applied.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The findings of this study are reported in two sections in this chapter. The first section reports the results from tests applied to data obtained from the counselor rating and counselor ranking forms. The second section includes the results of statistical procedures applied to data from the Westcott Scale.

Analysis of variance procedures were employed to determine the significance of differences among mean ratings of the defined counselor approach by different groups of subjects (Linquist, 1956). The .05 level of confidence was used as a basis for rejection of the assumed null hypothesis. Most of the hypotheses were directional; thus, the single tailed test was considered appropriate (Guilford, 1956, p. 207). In those hypotheses which did not specify the direction of the difference between means the two tailed test was employed and indicated where appropriate.

The results of tests applied to data obtained from the counselor ranking form are reported and compared with the results obtained from the rating form data for each hypothesis. Generally, a two cell Chi-square test of significance was used to determine the significance of a preferred approach within a group. Median tests were employed to determine significance of difference in ranking approaches between groups where hypothesized.

As pointed out earlier in this report, the use of ranking procedures by subjects to indicate their preference for particular approaches was intended to induce the subjects to indicate a definite preference. In contrast to the rating procedures, potential ties would be eliminated since the approaches were to be placed in rank order of preference.

The hypotheses, as stated, call for the approach in question to be ranked higher than the other four approaches. Using the non-parametric statistic Chi-square, one would expect the hypothesized approach to obtain the greatest number of highest rankings.

This procedure resulted in the loss of part of the information, in comparison with the analysis of rating data, in that no consideration was given to the degree of higher or lower ranking of the various approaches. Also, no separate consideration was given to equal ranking when individual rank order preferences were summed for each subject, since the hypotheses call for "highest" rank. Even though ties were to be eliminated and possibly greater discrimination obtained from ranking procedures, a large number of ties did result through required procedures in obtaining the median ranking score. Possibly the subjects were forced to make discriminations which were not psychologically meaningful to them. Some evidence indicated that subjects were procedurally forced to make a rank difference where no difference in preference existed.

The second section of the chapter reports the results of statistical procedures applied to the data obtained from the Westcott Scale. Included in this section are the reports of factoring procedures applied to the counselor rating scale to determine if the subjects were responding to the film episodes as separate and unique counseling approaches.

Tests of Hypotheses

The data have been analyzed to provide information about the preferences of different groups of adolescent subjects for various counseling approaches. In reporting the results each hypothesis and sub-hypothesis is considered separately.

Hypothesis I: Variations in preference for counseling approaches by subjects are related to typical cognitive styles of subjects as defined by Information Demand and Problem Solving Success.

A. Male Subjects

1. Low ID-High PSS subjects will tend to rate the Information Giving approach highest. In testing this hypothesis, the mean of the ratings of the Information Giving approach was compared separately with each of the other four approaches. The levels

Table 7

Means of Low ID-High PSS Male Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Means	p*
Advising	11.14	.155
Questioning	9.93	.102
Reflection of Feeling	9.67	.043
Supporting	10.81	.380
Information Giving	10.63	

F=2.11 p=.08

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of the Information Giving approach and the mean of each of the other four approaches.

of significance for each of the four tests are shown in Table 7. At the .05 level of confidence, the null hypothesis could not be rejected. Thus, hypothesis I.A.1 was not supported.

To test this hypothesis using ranking form data, the number of subjects ranking Information Giving the highest was compared to the number of subjects assigning equal or lesser rank to that approach when compared to each of the other four approaches. Table 8 illustrates the number of subjects preferring one approach over another as indicated by assigned rank. This procedure, outlined in Chapter III, yielded four separate two celled Chi-square values, none of which were significant. The results failed to support the hypothesis.

Inspection of the means presented in Table 7 would indicate that this group of males tend to prefer the Advising approach and reject the Questioning and Reflection of Feeling approaches. Supporting and Information Giving approaches are neither preferred nor rejected.

The hypothesis that this group of subjects would prefer Information Giving was based on the

Table 8

The Number of Low ID-High PSS Male Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-Preference for the Information Giving Approach by Rank Score When Compared to all Other Approaches

N=43

	Preference	Non Preference*	X^2	P
Information Giving vs. Reflection of Feeling	20	23	.09	.76
Information Giving vs. Advising	19	24	.37	.54
Information Giving vs. Questioning	25	18	.83	.36
Information Giving vs. Supporting	18	25	.83	.36

*Non-Preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks to the two approaches compared findings of the previously cited pilot study of a much smaller number of subjects. These subjects may perceive Advising as providing possible alternatives in decision making while Information Giving and Supporting do not provide any new or possible alternatives. Their anticipated rejection of the Questioning and Reflection of Feeling approaches, discussed in Chapter II, was supported by the results.

2. Low ID-Low PSS subjects will tend to prefer the Advising approach. As in hypothesis I.A.1, each of the approaches was compared to the hypothesized preferred approach. In this hypothesis, the mean rating of the Advising approach by this group of subjects was compared with each of the other four approaches. The means and confidence levels of differences can be seen in Table 9. The Advising approach was significantly preferred beyond the .05 level of confidence when compared to Questioning, Reflection of Feeling, and Information Giving; but it was not significantly preferred to the Supporting approach. Partial support for this hypothesis was indicated.

Table 9

Means of Low ID-Low PSS Male Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Means	p*
Advising	11.04	
Questioning	9.23	.006
Reflection of Feeling	8.71	.002
Supporting	10.57	.217
Information Giving	9.78	.011

F=4.07 p=.003

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of the Advising approach and the mean of each of the other four approaches.

A comparison of the number of subjects ranking the Advising approach highest on the ranking form compared to the other four approaches resulted in four separate Chi-square tests of significance shown in Table 10. A significant (p=.02) number of this group preferred the Advising approach when compared to Reflection of Feeling. All other preferences were in the hypothesized direction but not significant at the .05 level.

By referring to the means presented in Table 9, one can infer that the Advising approach appears to be the most preferred approach with Questioning, Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving being clearly rejected. The Supporting approach is neither the most preferred nor is it rejected.

With reference to the personality description of this group, as presented in Chapter II, an alternate explanation might be that these subjects wished to place the responsibility for their behavior externally. If they were advised or directed as to a plan of action, or if they were supported in what they were currently doing, then they would not have to assume

Table 10

The Number of Low ID-Low PSS Male Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-Preference for the Advising Approach When Compared to all Other Approaches

N=36

	Preference	Non Preference*	X^2	P
Advising vs. Reflection of Feeling	23	13	2.25	.12
Advising vs. Questioning	24	12	3.36	.06
Advising vs. Information Giving	21	15	.69	.41
Advising vs. Supporting	19	17	.02	.85

*Non-Preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks to the two approaches compared.

the responsibility for unsuccessful endeavors. Regardless of their reasons for preference, it does exist in the hypothesized direction, and this may suggest that a rapid method of successfully establishing a counseling relationship with this group initially would appear to be through specific advice and support of positive aspects of their behavior.

3. High ID-High PSS males will tend to rate the Supporting approach highest. At the .05 level of confidence, this group of subjects rejected both Questioning and Reflection of Feeling approaches when compared to the Supporting approach. The null hypothesis could not be rejected for differences between the Supporting approach and the Advising and Information Giving approaches.

The number of subjects of this group preferring the Supporting approach over the other four approaches on the ranking form are shown in Table 11. Only the difference in the number of subjects who preferred the Supporting approach over the Reflection of Feeling approach was significant at the .01 level of confidence.

Table 11

Means of High ID-High PSS Male Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Means	p*
Advising	10.83	.475
Questioning	9.16	.001
Reflection of Feeling	9.14	.001
Supporting	10.85	
Information Giving	10.02	.080

F= 4.42 p= .003

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of the Supporting approach and the mean of each of the other four approaches.

The findings appear to be in keeping with the logic offered for the hypothesis except for the high preference indicated for the Advising approach. The means presented in Table 12 seem to indicate an almost equal preference for Advising and Supporting approaches. Apparently the Advising approach is also perceived as external feedback for the conservative behavior of this group. As hypothesized, Reflection of Feeling, Questioning and Information Giving approaches evidently do not provide the external support and direction from significant adult figures desired by this group.

4. High ID-Low PSS males will tend to accept all approaches equally. The hypothesis as stated indicated that the null hypothesis would not be rejected in a one-group-by-five treatments F-test comparing the ratings of the five approaches simultaneously. The F-ratio thus obtained, shown in Table 13, indicated a difference among the ratings of the approaches by this group well beyond the .05 level of confidence; thus, the hypothesis was not supported.

The two cell Chi-square procedure was applied to the ranked data which compared the number of

Table 12

The Number of High ID-High PSS Male Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-Preference for the Supporting Approach When Compared to all Other Approaches

N=36

	Preference	Non Preference*	X^2	P
Supporting vs. Reflection of Feeling	22	14	1.36	.24
Supporting vs. Advising	17	19	.02	.85
Supporting vs. Questioning	28	8	10.02	.01-
Supporting vs. Information Giving	20	16	.25	.62

*Non-Preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks to the two approaches compared.

Table 13

Means of High ID-Low PSS Male Ratings
of Counselor Approaches

Approach	Means	F-ratio	p
Advising	10.41	5.513	.001-
Questioning	9.15		
Reflection of Feeling	8.79		
Supporting	10.96		
Information Giving	10.67		

subjects who assigned a higher rank to a given approach with the number of subjects that assigned equal or higher ranks to all other approaches. The numbers of subjects preferring each approach, along with those not preferring that approach in each comparison, are shown in Table 14. In order for the hypothesis to be supported, all Chi-square values had to remain insignificant; thus, the null hypothesis would not be rejected. The comparison between the number of subjects preferring the Questioning approach compared to the number of subjects ranking the Supporting approach equal to or less than the Questioning approach was significant at the .03 level. This was a result of ties which can readily be seen when the Supporting approach is compared to the Questioning approach. The same thing occurred when Questioning was compared to Information Giving, resulting in a significant difference at the .01 level of confidence. When the reverse comparison was made, the confidence level fell to .06. This indicates a tendency to reject the Questioning approach but not at the desired level of confidence. Thus

Table 14

The Number of High ID-Low PSS Males Indicating Preference for Specific Approaches in Comparison to all Other Approaches

N=43

	Preference	Non Preference	X^2	P
Advising vs. Reflection of Feeling	23	20	.09	.76
Advising vs. Questioning	23	20	.09	.76
Advising vs. Information Giving	19	24	.37	.54
Advising vs. Supporting	17	26	1.48	.22
Reflection of Feeling vs. Advising	17	26	1.48	.22
Reflection of Feeling vs. Questioning	21	22	.00	1.00
Reflection of Feeling vs. Information Giving	15	28	3.34	.06
Reflection of Feeling vs. Supporting	17	26	1.48	.22
Questioning vs. Reflection of Feeling	20	23	.09	.76
Questioning vs. Advising	15	28	3.34	.06
Questioning vs. Information Giving	13	30	5.95	.01
Questioning vs. Supporting	14	29	4.55	.03
Information Giving vs. Reflection of Feeling	25	18	.83	.36
Information Giving vs. Advising	24	19	.37	.54
Information Giving vs. Questioning	28	15	3.34	.06
Information Giving vs. Supporting	24	19	.37	.54
Supporting vs. Reflection of Feeling	26	17	1.48	.22
Supporting vs. Advising	26	17	1.48	.22
Supporting vs. Questioning	24	19	.37	.54
Supporting vs. Information Giving	16	27	2.32	.12

the hypothesis is partially supported by the results of the Chi-square statistic, but is not supported by the results of the ranking data. Considering the lack of sensitivity and loss of information in nonparametric data, the failure to discover differences where differences do exist would be expected.

High ID-Low PSS male subjects (Westcott's "anxious ones") were expected to fail to differentiate among the counseling approaches. That is, they would perceive any approach as help for their difficulties. Possibly Reflection of Feeling and Questioning approaches were too threatening, and the subjects found greater comfort in the direction offered by the counselors in the other approaches. There is also the possibility that the Reflection of Feeling approach conveys passivity on the part of the counselor when the counselee needs tangible evidence that the adult cares and is involved with him. Questioning may be construed as prying into personal matters that are considered irrelevant by the student.

B. Female Subjects

1. Low ID-High PSS females will tend to

rate Reflection of Feeling highest. The mean ratings of this group of subjects for the different approaches are reported in Table 15. The mean of each approach was tested independently against the mean of each of the other four approaches. Confidence levels of the tests are also shown in Table 15. The hypothesis was not supported since the mean rating for the Reflection of Feeling approach was the lowest of the five approaches.

The ranking form data also failed to support the hypothesis since the non-preferred rankings were more numerous than preferred ranking when the Reflection of Feeling approach was compared to all other approaches. As can be seen in Table 16, the number of non-preference rankings was significant beyond the .05 level of confidence when Reflection of Feeling is compared to the Advising and Supporting approaches and at the .08 level when compared to the Questioning approach.

Inspection of the means indicates that the Advising approach was the most preferred approach. Reflection of Feeling, Information Giving, and

Table 15

Means of Low ID-High PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Means	p*
Advising	10.87	.001
Questioning	9.95	.024
Reflection of Feeling	8.91	
Supporting	9.64	.087
Information Giving	9.52	.159

F=4.09 p=.004

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of the Reflection of Feeling approach and the mean of each of the other four approaches.

Table 16

The Number of Low ID-High PSS Female Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-Preference for the Reflection of Feeling Approach When Compared to all Other Approaches

N=42

	Preference	Non Preference*	X^2	P
Reflection of Feeling vs. Advising	10	32	10.05	.01-
Reflection of Feeling vs. Questioning	15	27	2.88	.08
Reflection of Feeling vs. Information Giving	17	25	1.16	.27
Reflection of Feeling vs. Supporting	14	28	4.02	.04

*Non-Preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks to the two approaches compared.

Supporting approaches appear to be rejected, with Questioning neither preferred nor rejected.

2. Low ID-Low PSS females will tend to prefer the Advising approach and rate it higher than male subjects of the same group. The first part of the hypothesis was partially supported, as shown in Table 17. This group of subjects tended to prefer the Advising approach above all the other approaches. The difference between the mean ratings of the Supporting and Advising approaches was not significant at the .05 level with p=.085.

The results of the test between mean ratings of male and female subjects of this group for the Advising approach are shown in Table 18. This portion of the hypothesis was not supported at the .05 level of confidence.

In addition, the counselor ranking form data did not support the hypothesis. There appeared to be a tendency in the hypothesized direction when Advising was compared with Reflection of Feeling, Questioning and Information Giving, but the Chi-square values presented in Table 19 failed to reach the desired level of significance.

Table 17

Means of Low ID-Low PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Means	p*
Advising	11.56	
Questioning	10.54	.042
Reflection of Feeling	9.05	.001-
Supporting	10.70	.085
Information Giving	9.72	.001-

F= 4.23 p= .003

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of Advising approach and the mean of each of the other four approaches.

Table 18

Means of Low ID-Low PSS Male and Female Ratings
of Advising Approach

Male	Female	p
11.04	11.56	.19-

Table 19

The Number of Low ID-Low PSS Female Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-Preference for the Advising Approach When Compared to all Other Approaches

N=50

	Preference	Non Preference*	X^2	P
Advising vs. Reflection of Feeling	31	19	2.42	.11
Advising vs. Questioning	28	22	.50	.48
Advising vs. Information Giving	30	20	1.62	.20
Advising vs. Supporting	22	28	.50	.48

*Non-preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks to the two approaches compared.

The second part of the hypothesis was also not supported by the analysis of ranked data. Applying the statistical procedures outlined in Chapter III, resulting in a two-by-two contingency table represented by Table 20, no difference was evident in the way males and females ranked the Advising approach.

The means presented in Table 17 indicate that the Advising and Supporting approaches are the most preferred approaches, with the Questioning approach neither preferred nor rejected. Both Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving were significantly rejected. The Supporting approach specifically used content which referred to the counselor working together with the counselee on specific aspects of the counselee's problem. The Advising approach clearly specified steps which were to be taken by the counselee. Both approaches offered a good deal of structure and decision-making by the counselor. Thus, the possibility exists that the desire for structure by the subjects of this group may constitute the basis for their

Table 20

Number of Low ID-Low PSS Females and Males Ranking the Advising Approach About the Grand Median Rank Score Obtained From Both Groups Combined

	Above Median	Below Median
Female (N=50)	23	27
Male (N=36)	20	16

X^2=43 P=.51

preference. The rejection of the Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving approaches may be due to lack of structure provided by these approaches or, as reasoned in Chapter II, failure to see the relevance of such approaches to the solution of the problems at hand.

The second part of the hypothesis dealt with differences between male and female responses to the Advising approach. The failure of females to rate the Advising approach significantly higher than males of the same group may have occurred because of the inclusion of ninth grade subjects in the data. The younger group rated Advising higher; therefore, they were in closer agreement. In other words, as young people get older, it may be less acceptable for boys to accept advise from significant others than for girls.

3. High ID-High PSS females will tend to prefer the Supporting approach, and will rate it higher than male subjects of the same group. The results of the tests among the mean ratings for the Supporting approach and each of the other four

approaches are shown in Table 21. At the .05 level of confidence, the first portion of the hypothesis was not supported.

In a test of the second part of the hypothesis, the mean rating of males for the Supporting approach was compared to the mean female rating of that approach and illustrated in Table 22. The hypothesis was not supported at the .05 level of confidence, but the difference was in the hypothesized direction (p=.12).

The number of preferred rankings assigned to the Supporting approach by this group of subjects, presented in Table 23, was significantly (beyond the .01 level of confidence) greater than the number of non-preference rankings when compared to Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving approaches, and had a significantly greater number of preferred rankings at the .06 level of confidence when compared to Questioning. It did not appear to be significantly preferred over the Advising approach.

The second part of the hypothesis was not

Table 21

Means of High ID-High PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches and F-ratio of all Approaches Simultaneously

Approach	Mean	p*
Advising	10.78	.123
Questioning	10.37	.012
Reflection of Feeling	9.01	.001-
Supporting	11.60	
Information Giving	9.11	.001-

F=3.94 p=.005

*Level of confidence of differences between the mean of Supporting approach and the mean of each of the other four approaches.

Table 22

Means of High ID-High PSS Male and Female Ratings of Supporting Approach

Male	Female	p
10.85	11.60	.12

Table 23

The Number of High ID-High PSS Female Subjects Indicating Preference and Non-Preference for the Supporting Approach When Compared to all Other Approaches

N=50

	Preference	Non Preference*	X^2	P
Supporting vs. Reflection of Feeling	35	15	7.22	.01-
Supporting vs. Advising	28	22	.50	.48
Supporting vs. Questioning	32	18	3.38	.06
Supporting vs. Information Giving	34	16	5.78	.01

*Non-Preference number includes subjects assigning equal ranks to the two approaches compared.

supported by ranked data. The number of female and male subjects ranking the Supporting approach above a median rank obtained from these two groups combined is shown in Table 24. The difference in number of males and females above and below the median failed to approach significance.

Inspection of the means presented in Table 21, indicates that the Supporting and Advising approaches are the approaches preferred by this group, with Reflection of Feeling and Information Giving being rejected. The Questioning approach is neither preferred nor rejected. Although not significant at the .05 level of confidence, the difference between the mean ratings of the Supporting and Advising approaches was in the hypothesized direction. The rank score data appeared to be in agreement with the rating score findings. Possibly the Advising approach was perceived as highly supportive; hence, the insignificant distinction made between preferences for the two approaches. If this were the case, then the premise on which the hypothesis was drawn still holds. This group of females is "conforming" and sees Advising as a form of supportive feedback.

Table 24

The Number of High ID-High PSS Females and Males Ranking the Supporting Approach About the Grand Median Rank Score Obtained from Both Groups Combined

	Above Median	Below Median
Female (N=50)	27	23
Male (N=36)	16	20

$X^2=.43$ P=.51

The second part of the hypothesis predicted differences between males and females of this group in rating the Supporting approach with females predicted to rate it higher. The means were in the expected direction, although p was only at the .12 level of confidence. The results obtained from the rank score data were in agreement, but not as significant as the rating scale data. Again, as in previous hypotheses, it may be that the inclusion of the younger sample, in which males and females would both rate the Supporting approach higher than twelfth graders, has produced little difference within the total sample.

4. High ID-Low PSS females will tend to rate all approaches equally, but at the same time, higher than the mean ratings of each other group of each approach. The mean ratings of this group of subjects for all counseling approaches are shown in Table 25. A one-group-by-five-treatments F-test comparing the ratings of the five approaches simultaneously was employed to test for differences. The resulting F-ratio, shown in Table

Table 25

Means of High ID-Low PSS Female Ratings of Counselor Approaches

Approach	Means	F-ratio	p
Advising	10.68	2.894	.023
Questioning	11.06		
Reflection of Feeling	8.85		
Supporting	10.27		
Information Giving	10.02		

25 indicated that this portion of the hypothesis was not supported. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected.

The test of the second part of the hypothesis called for a comparison of the mean rating of each group on each approach with the mean rating of the High ID-Low PSS group on each approach. The means of each group for each approach are shown in Table 26, along with the confidence level of differences of all means compared to the mean rating of the High ID-Low PSS females. This portion of the hypothesis was not supported.

The first part of the hypothesis was not supported by results of the ranking data. It can be seen in Table 27 that the Reflection of Feeling approach was not preferred over Questioning and that Questioning approach was preferred by a significant (at the .01 level) number of subjects over the Reflection of Feeling approach. Also, the Reflection of Feeling approach was not preferred over the Supporting approach, but the Supporting approach was preferred over the Reflection of

Table 26

Mean Ratings of all Groups of all Counseling Approaches

	Advising	Questioning	Reflection	Supporting	Information
	Means (p*)	Means (p*)	Means (p*)	Means (p*)	Means (p*)
Female					
High ID-Low PSS	10.68	11.06	8.85	10.27	10.20
Low ID-Low PSS	11.56 (.07)	10.54 (.19)	9.05 (.38)	10.76 (.24)	9.72 (.32)
High ID-High PSS	10.79 (.44)	10.37 (.12)	9.01 (.40)	11.60 (.02)	9.11 (.07)
Low ID-High PSS	10.87 (.39)	9.95 (.03)	8.19 (.46)	9.64 (.18)	9.52 (.23)
Male					
High ID-Low PSS	10.41 (.33)	9.15 (.001)	8.79 (.46)	10.96 (.15)	10.67 (.13)
Low ID-Low PSS	11.04 (.30)	9.20 (.004)	8.71 (.42)	10.57 (.34)	9.78 (.35)
High ID-High PSS	10.83 (.41)	9.10 (.002)	9.14 (.34)	10.85 (.21)	10.02 (.49)
Low ID-High PSS	11.13 (.46)	9.93 (.007)	9.67 (.39)	10.81 (.45)	10.63 (.29)

*Level of confidence of two tailed test shown in parenthesis of each Mean tested against Low ID-High PSS Mean within one approach.

Table 27

The Number of High ID-Low PSS Females Indicating Preference for Specific Approaches in Comparison to all Other Approaches

N=42

	Pref- erence	Non Pref- erence	X^2	P
Reflection of Feeling vs. Advising	15	27	2.88	.08
Reflection of Feeling vs. Questioning	11	31	8.59	.01-
Reflection of Feeling vs. Information Giving	17	25	1.16	.27
Reflection of Feeling vs. Supporting	14	28	4.02	.04
Advising vs. Reflection of Feeling	26	16	1.92	.16
Advising vs. Questioning	21	21	.02	.87
Advising vs. Information Giving	24	18	.59	.44
Advising vs. Supporting	20	22	.02	.87
Questioning vs. Reflection of Feeling	29	13	5.35	.01
Questioning vs. Advising	21	21	.02	.87
Questioning vs. Information Giving	21	21	.02	.87
Questioning vs. Supporting	19	23	.21	.64
Information Giving vs. Reflection of Feeling	24	18	.59	.44
Information Giving vs. Advising	16	26	1.92	.16
Information Giving vs. Questioning	18	24	.59	.44
Information Giving vs. Supporting	18	24	.59	.44
Supporting vs. Reflection of Feeling	28	14	4.02	.04
Supporting vs. Advising	17	25	1.16	.27
Supporting vs. Questioning	18	24	.59	.44
Supporting vs. Information Giving	22	20	.02	.87

Feeling approach at the .04 level of confidence.

In order to test the second part of this hypothesis, the number of subjects in this group ranking a given approach was compared to the number within every group ranking the same approach. A median ranking score was obtained from the two groups combined in each case. The number of subjects of different groups assigning ranks above and below the medians for each group and approach is presented in Tables 28-34. In only two instances of thirty-five two-by-two Chi-square tests were significant results obtained in the hypothesized direction. The High ID-Low PSS females ranked the Questioning approach higher in greater number of instances than did High ID-Low PSS males (.02 level of confidence) and High ID-High PSS males (beyond the .01 level of confidence). This portion of the hypothesis, therefore, is not supported.

Inspection of the means in Table 25 indicated that all approaches were rated about the same, except the Reflection of Feeling approach. These findings were supported by the rank score data.

Table 28

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-High PSS Males

Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	Female High ID-Low PSS (N=42)	26	16
	Male Low ID-High PSS (N=43)	16	27
	X^2=4.24 P=.03		
Advising	Female High ID-Low PSS (N=42)	20	22
	Male Low ID-High PSS (N=43)	22	21
	X^2=1.99 P=.15		
Questioning	Female High ID-Low PSS (N=42)	17	25
	Male Low ID-High PSS (N=43)	25	18
	X^2=1.99 P=.15		
Information Giving	Female High ID-Low PSS (N=42)	21	21
	Male Low ID-High PSS (N=43)	21	22
	X^2=.01 P=.90		
Supporting	Female High ID-Low PSS (N=42)	21	21
	Male Low ID-High PSS (N=43)	21	22
	X^2=.01 P=.90		

Table 29

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and High ID-Low PSS Males

Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	23	19
	High ID-Low PSS Males (N=43)	19	24
	X^2=.57 P=.54		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	High ID-Low PSS Males (N=43)	22	21
	X^2=.01 P=.90		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	15	27
	High ID-Low PSS Males (N=43)	27	16
	X^2=5.19 P=.02		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	High ID-Low PSS Males (N=43)	18	25
	X^2=1.42 P=.23		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	High ID-Low PSS Males (N=43)	20	23
	X^2=.10 P=.74		

Table 30

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and High ID-High PSS Males Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	High ID-High PSS Males (N=36)	15	21
	X^2=1.28 P=.25		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	High ID-High PSS Males (N=36)	15	21
	X^2=1.28 P=.25		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	14	28
	High ID-High PSS Males (N=36)	25	11
	X^2=8.71 P=.01-		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	High ID-High PSS Males (N=36)	18	18
	X^2=.05 P=.81		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	23	19
	High ID-High PSS Males (N=36)	16	20
	X^2=.46 P=.50		

Table 31

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-Low PSS Males

Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	Low ID-Low PSS Males (N=36)	18	18
	X^2=.05 P=.81		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	Low ID-Low PSS Males (N=36)	15	21
	X^2=1.28 P=.25		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	18	24
	Low ID-Low PSS Males (N=36)	21	15
	X^2=1.28 P=.25		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-Low PSS Males (N=36)	17	19
	X^2=.05 P=.81		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-Low PSS Males (N=36)	17	19
	X^2=.05 P=.81		

Table 32

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-Low PSS Females Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-Low PSS Females (N=50)	24	26
	X^2=.04 P=.82		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-Low PSS Females (N=50)	24	26
	X^2=.04 P=.82		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	Low ID-Low PSS Females (N=50)	26	24
	X^2=.04 P=.82		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	Low ID-Low PSS Females (N=50)	26	24
	X^2=.04 P=.82		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-Low PSS Females (N=50)	24	26
	X^2=.04 P=.82		

Table 33

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and Low ID-High PSS Females Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-High PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	X^2=.94 P=.82		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	Low ID-High PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	X^2=.04 P=.82		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	Low ID-High PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	X^2=.04 P=.82		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	Low ID-High PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	X^2=.00 P=1.00		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	Low ID-High PSS Females (N=42)	21	21
	X^2=.00 P=1.00		

Table 34

Number of Subjects of High ID-Low PSS Females and High ID-High PSS Females

Ranking Each Approach Above and Below Median of Two Groups Combined for Each Approach

Approach	Groups	Below Median	Above Median
Reflection of Feeling	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	High ID-High PSS Females (N=50)	22	28
	$X^2=1.09$ $P=.29$		
Advising	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	22	20
	High ID-High PSS Females (N=50)	24	26
	$X^2=.04$ $P=.82$		
Questioning	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	20	22
	High ID-High PSS Females (N=50)	26	24
	$X^2=.04$ $P=.82$		
Information Giving	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	19	23
	High ID-High PSS Females (N-50)	27	23
	$X^2=.39$ $P=.53$		
Supporting	High ID-Low PSS Females (N=42)	24	18
	High ID-High PSS Females (N=50)	22	28
	$X^2=1.09$ $P=.29$		

Assuming that this group are anxious and threatened as Westcott describes them, a possible interpretation of the results would be that dealing with feelings presents too great a threat to these subjects. It would also indicate that almost any approach is acceptable as long as it is not on a feeling or emotional level.

The second portion of the hypothesis for this group of subjects was more than ambitious. The mean rating of each approach by the High ID-Low PSS females was expected to be higher than the mean ratings by all other groups of each approach. There were, then, thirty-five chances of failure for support of the hypothesis.

As indicated in Table 26, few of the differences tested were significant; and in most cases, those that were significant were in the wrong direction. The startling exception was the high rating given to the Questioning approach by this group of females, particularly in comparison with all groups of males. The same finding was supported by the rank score data. The confidence level of differences in means of this group compared to Low ID-Low PSS, High ID-High PSS, and Low ID-High PSS females were p=.19, p=.12 and p=.03, respectively, in the hypothesized direction. Even among females alone, the trend, though not highly significant, was evident. The comparison of the Low ID-Low PSS female group mean rating with the male group mean rating resulted in significance between means beyond the .05 level of confidence.

The question posed here seems to be a two-sided one. Why do the females of this group rate Questioning higher than other groups of females and males and/or why do males tend to rate the Questioning approach so low? Females may have found this approach quite natural, while males were responding in a rather defensive manner. Together with the apparent rejection of Reflection of Feelings by this group, the preference for Questioning may indicate that Questioning helps reduce anxiety by focusing on small portions of problems, namely, through answers to questions. The implication is that Questioning may be a highly useful approach in establishing a counseling relationship with females.

Hypothesis II: Ninth-grade subjects will tend to rate Advising and Supporting approaches higher than twelfth-grade subjects. The assumption was supported, and the null hypothesis was rejected. The results of the mean comparisons are shown in Table 35. Ninth-grade subjects rated both Advising and Supporting approaches significantly higher than did twelfth-grade subjects.

The number of subjects in each group ranking the Advising approach above and below the median of the combined groups are shown in Table 36. The difference in ranking between these groups was in the hypothesized direction, but failed to achieve the required level of confidence for the rejection of the null hypothesis.

The results of the same subjects ranking the Supporting approach are presented in Table 37. Again, as in the first part of the hypothesis, the numbers are in the hypothesized direction, but failed to reach the desired level of significance.

Table 35

Mean Ratings of all Ninth and Twelfth Grade Subjects on Advising and Supporting Approaches

	Means		
	Ninth Grade	Twelfth Grade	p*
Advising	11.31	10.51	.005
Supporting	11.25	10.15	.001-

*Single tail test.

Table 36

The Number of Ninth and Twelfth Grade Subjects Ranking the Advising Approach Above or Below the Median of the Combined Groups

	Below Median	Above Median
Ninth Grade Subjects (N=195)	90	105
Twelfth Grade Subjects (N=147)	81	66

$X^2=2.33$ P=.12

Table 37

The Number of Ninth and Twelfth Grade Subjects Ranking the Supporting Approach Above and Below the Median of the Combined Groups

	Below Median	Above Median
Ninth Grade Subjects (N=195)	93	102
Twelfth Grade Subjects (N=147)	78	69

$X^2=.76$ P=.61

Hypothesis II was primarily concerned with the developmental aspect of adolescent perceptions. The assumption on which the hypothesis was based simply stated that the younger the subject, the more advice and support is sought and expected. The Advising and Supporting approaches were rated higher by ninth-grade subjects, when compared to twelfth-grade subjects, well beyond the .01 level of confidence. This clear-cut result is one which counselor's of younger students might wish to consider. The reader is reminded that the approaches rated in this study were only three-minute portrayals of initial counseling sessions. What the results have in common with the establishment of the counseling relationship in its fullest meaning or in later sessions is not touched upon in this study. It seems safe to suggest that counselee preferences play some part on the client's side of the relationship establishing process.

Although all hypotheses were by no means unequivocally supported, considerable information was obtained concerning the preferences for and rejections of specific counseling approaches by adolescents in the first few minutes of the counseling interview. The findings are summarized in Table 38 for convenient perusal.

Both male and female adolescents indicated a preference for the Advising approach when asked to place themselves in the role of the counselee in the film. The Supporting approach was also preferred by all groups except the Low ID-High PSS subjects who neither preferred nor rejected it.

The Reflection of Feeling approach was rejected by all groups, both male and female. Consistently that approach was rated lower by all groups of subjects.

Males consistently rejected the Questioning approach, while females rated it somewhat higher. In one instance, High ID-Low PSS females, it was rated as one of the preferred approaches.

The Information Giving approach was rejected by all females except the High ID-Low PSS group. On the other hand, High ID-Low PSS males indicated a preference for the above approach; while Low ID-Low PSS males rejected it; and Low ID-High PSS males

Table 38

Summary of Preferences for and Rejections of all Counseling Approaches

by all Cognitive Groups and by Sex

		Low ID High PSS	Low ID Low PSS	High ID High PSS	High ID Low PSS
Preferred Approaches	Males	Advising	Advising	Advising Supporting	Advising Supporting Info. Giving
	Females	Advising	Advising Supporting	Advising Supporting	Advising Supporting Questioning Info. Giving
Approaches Neither Preferred Nor Rejected	Males	Supporting Info. Giving	Supporting	Info. Giving	
	Females	Questioning	Questioning	Questioning	
Rejected Approaches	Males	Questioning Refl. of Feeling	Questioning Refl. of Feeling Info. Giving	Questioning Refl. of Feeling	Questioning Refl. of Feeling
	Females	Refl. of Feeling Info. Giving Supporting	Refl. of Feeling Info. Giving	Refl. of Feeling Info. Giving	Refl. of Feeling

and High ID-High PSS males neither preferred nor rejected Information Giving

Although not originally hypothesized, inspection of the number of preferred and rejected approaches by High ID and Low ID groups (Table 38) indicates that the number of acceptable approaches is positively related to information demand. By making a comparison of number of approaches preferred and rejected with the High PSS and Low PSS groups, it appears that an inverse relationship is present. In other words, as information demand decreases and success in problem solving increases, there appears to be less preference for different kinds of approaches. When information demand increases and success in problem solving decreases, there appears to be greater acceptance of and preference for different kinds of counseling approaches. These findings need further research specifically related to the covariance of the two cognitive dimensions and preference for different counseling approaches. It should also be noted that the Advising approach was preferred by all cognitive groups of males and females. At the same time, the Reflection of Feeling approach was rejected by both males and females of each cognitive group.

Further research is necessary to determine the degree to which the expressed preference when viewing a counseling situation is the same as preference when actually in a counseling situation. The findings in the present study indicate that subjects do have preferences for specified approaches, but do not indicate that these preferences would be the same as in a real counseling session.

The relationship among cognitive style, counselor approach, counseling process and eventual outcome of counseling also needs to be researched. For example, if the present findings of preferences for different approaches by different cognitive groups are the same as those subjects in real counseling situations, what kinds of relationships evolve? Do the preferences change over several counseling sessions? When subjects with specific cognitive styles are confronted with specific counseling approaches, which pairings become most successful? While this study provides some valuable information about the relationship between cognitive styles and adolescents' expressed preferences for various counseling approaches, it is really only a beginning.

Factor Analysis of Rating Scale Responses

The absence of significant differences among mean ratings of approaches suggested the possibility that the subjects were not responding to the different films as distinct counseling approaches. Factoring procedures (Fruchter, 1954) were applied to determine if the approaches were functioning as distinctively as the face validity of items established by judges would indicate. In consideration of the possibility of differences in ratings because of differences in sex, male ratings and female ratings were factored separately, matched together, and then matched with the pilot data (Kaiser, 1958).

Males

The results of factoring male film ratings are summarized in Table 39. The procedures employed

Table 39

Factor Loadings by Item Scores and Total Scores of all Males on Counselor Rating Scale

N=200

Item	Factors				
	I	II	III	IV	V
	Sup.	Ref.	Info.	Quest.	Adv.
1	90*	01	01	09	13
2	89	07	11	09	18
3	90	02	03	15	09
Total	98	02	05	12	15
1	02	86	00	13	05
2	01	86	06	01	08
3	01	86	07	09	09
Total	01	99	04	09	04
1	05	10	90	00	08
2	06	03	87	06	08
3	03	00	84	07	05
Total	05	05	99	05	08
1	12	11	02	89	08
2	08	07	04	90	11
3	11	07	09	88	01
Total	11	09	04	98	08
1	14	02	04	11	88
2	09	06	11	11	89
3	17	04	11	02	85
Total	15	04	09	07	97

Percent of variance extracted 83.97.

*All decimals omitted, figures carried to two decimal places.

resulted in the generation of five factors which corresponded to the five counseling approaches. It should be noted that there were no factor loadings of less than .84 for any item from the rating scale and no loadings of less than .97 for the total rating score.

Females

The same procedures were applied to the female sample that were used with the male sample, and results are presented in Table 40. Again, five factors were generated which corresponded to the five counselor approaches. Item loadings on the respective factors were above .83, while total score loadings were above .99 on their respective factors.

Pilot Study Males

The ratings of the pilot study (Chapter II) sample of forty males were factored using the same procedure previously applied to males and females of the study sample. The results of this analysis are shown in Table 41. The item loadings on the

Table 40

Factor Loadings by Items Scores and Total Scores of all Females on Counselor Rating Scale

N=198

Items	Factors				
	I Sup.	II Ref.	III Info.	IV Quest.	V Adv.
1	93*	08	02	03	01
2	90	02	03	10	05
3	86	07	02	08	03
Total	99	01	03	08	01
1	04	89	00	02	08
2	07	91	03	02	10
3	04	87	01	02	09
Total	03	99	01	01	10
1	08	03	83	06	02
2	03	00	88	03	06
3	00	02	83	11	00
Total	04	02	99	07	01
1	01	04	03	85	04
2	07	06	00	88	04
3	18	00	10	84	01
Total	08	01	05	99	03
1	01	00	04	01	88
2	02	11	00	02	91
3	05	16	00	05	83
Total	00	10	01	03	99

Percent of variance extracted 83.97

*All decimals omitted, figures carried to two decimal places.

Table 41

Factor Loadings by Item Scores and Total Scores of Pilot Study Males on Counselor Rating Scale

N=40

Item	Factors				
	I. Sup.	II Ref.	III Info.	IV Quest.	V Adv.
1	92*	01	05	10	04
2	88	02	06	00	18
3	89	03	04	04	15
Total	95	07	04	10	19
1	14	84	22	16	02
2	14	81	14	02	09
3	11	90	05	06	08
Total	02	98	12	07	01
1	15	04	86	19	04
2	02	16	92	01	02
3	04	13	58	13	48
Total	06	13	95	12	19
1	01	00	41	79	22
2	10	09	04	82	03
3	05	08	01	87	06
Total	06	06	16	97	06
1	16	22	12	01	82
2	19	03	28	13	73
3	14	09	07	01	83
Total	19	06	13	05	95

Percent of variance extracted 83.44.

*All decimals omitted, figures carried to two decimal places five extracted factors were generally above .79. Item number one of Factor IV loaded at .41 on Factor III, and Item number three of Factor III loaded .48 on Factor V. The majority (12 of 15 item loadings) were above .80. All remaining loadings were below .22 and mostly below .10. The total rating scale scores loaded .95 or above on the respective factors corresponding to the five counselor approaches.

Factor Matching

Although five factors were extracted from male, female and the pilot study male sample data, and it appeared as though the factors were the same for all three samples; there was no statistical assurance that this was so. In order to determine the similarity of the factors of the three samples, factor matching procedures were employed. The results of the factor matching are summarized in Tables 42, 43 and 44. Comparisons were made of Males vs. Females, Males vs. Pilot Study Males, and Females vs. Pilot Study Males respectively. All five factors extracted from each of the three samples

Table 42

Factor Matching Males vs. Females of Five Factors Extracted from Each Sample

Females (N=198)	Males (N=200) I Sup	 II Ref	 III Info	 IV Ques	 V Adv
Sup I	.99				
Info II			.99		
Ques III				.99	
Ref IV		.99			
Adv V					.99

All invariance coefficients less than .01 were omitted from the table.

Table 43

Factor Matching Males vs. Pilot Study Males of Five Factors Extracted from Each Sample

	Males (N=200)				
Pilot Males (N=40)	I Sup	II Ref	III Info	IV Ques	V Adv
Sup I	.99				
Ref II		.99			
Ques III				.99	
Info IV			.99		
Adv V					.99

All invariance coefficients less than .02 were omitted from the table.

Table 44

Factor Matching Females vs. Pilot Study Males of Five Factors Extracted from Each Sample

Pilot Males (N=40)	Females (N=198) I Sup	II Info	III Ques	IV Ref	V Adv
Sup I	.99				
Ref II				.99	
Ques III			.99		
Info IV		.99			
Adv V					.99

All invariance coefficients less than .02 were omitted from the table.

matched. All three groups of subjects responded to each of the five approaches to counseling as separate and distinct techniques.

The results of the factoring procedures applied to the counselor rating scale were interpreted as an indication that the subjects were responding to the different approaches as separate and distinct constructs. The tendency to rate two or more approaches high (or low) was not a result, then, of not seeing the difference, but the results of a willingness to rate them equally if the subjects felt that way.

The high factor loadings on rotated factors indicated an extremely high internal consistency of the three items in the rating scale. Often, of course, there is a tendency to base one's willingness to relate to a counselor on the counselor's helpfulness and understanding.

Another reason for the high rotated factor loadings is the inclusion of three scores linearly related to the total score in the factor matrix. This procedure artificially raises the level of the factor loading. Inspection of the item intercorrelations, however, indicates that neither the factor sturcture nor the factor loadings would change appreciably if the total score had been left out of the matrix.

One of the major implications of the factor study is that five counseling approaches have been established to which adolescent subjects respond as distinct approaches. This finding is in contrast with the considerable volume of counseling literature which suggests that the discreet responses of the counselor are much less important than counselor attitude, ability to relate, or experience. The evidence presented here suggests that subjects do respond to different counselor statements in quite different ways.

Conclusions and Implication for Research

Chapter IV contained the results and discussions of the findings of this study. Analysis of the data obtained from the counselor rating and counselor ranking forms yielded considerable information concerning the preferences and rejections of the four cognitive groups as defined by the Westcott Problem Solving Scale. All four of the cognitive groups tended to prefer the Advising approach and to reject the Reflection of Feeling approach. In addition, High ID-High PSS and High ID-Low PSS subjects also preferred the Supporting approach.

Several sex differences were also noted when the data was analyzed. The Questioning approach was rejected by all males. All females except the High ID-Low PSS group rejected the Information Giving approach. The Questioning approach was neither rejected nor preferred by all females except the High ID-Low PSS group who preferred it.

Analysis of the data supported the hypothesis that younger subjects tend to rate the Advising and Supporting approach higher than older subjects. Ninth-grade subjects rated both Advising and Supporting approaches significantly higher than did twelfth-grade subjects.

In general, then, the adolescent subjects in this study indicated a preference for the Advising approach. This particular preference was evident in ninth- and twelfth-graders of both sexes and all four cognitive groups. In addition, the Reflection of Feeling approach was rejected by all subjects, regardless of age-grade, sex, or cognitive group.

In order to determine if the five counseling approaches were functioning as distinctively as the face validity of the items established by judges would indicate, factoring procedures were applied. Male ratings and female ratings were factored separately, matched together, and then matched with the pilot data. All five factors extracted from each of the three samples matched. The results of the factoring and matching procedures were interpreted as an indication that the subjects were responding to the different approaches as separate and distinct constructs. One of the major implications of the factor study is that five counseling approaches have been established to which adolescent subjects respond as distinct approaches. This finding is in contrast to much of the counseling literature which suggests that the discreet responses of the counselor are much less important that counselor attitude, ability to relate, or experience.

The data in this study was collected from adolescents who were asked to rate an initial, filmed counseling session as if they were the counselee. Additional research, however, is needed to ascertain the degree to which the expressed preference when viewing the filmed, initial session is the same as when actually in a counseling session. Further research is also needed to investigate whether expressed preferences remain the same or change as the counseling situation continues over a period of time. Another question which is in need of study is "what is the relationship of expressed preferences and rejections of approaches to the continued development of the client-counselor relationship and to successful outcome?" While this study provides some valuable information about the relationship between cognitive styles and adolescents' expressed preferences for various counseling approaches, sound generalization to actual counseling situations must await answers to the questions posed above.

Appendix A

Instructions for Film Rating

Name ____

The films you see will be those of a counselor and a high school student in an initial counseling session. You are to view each episode carefully, trying to put yourself in the part of the student.

After viewing each episode you are to rate the items on the rating sheet as follows:

1. The degree to which you feel the counselor is helpful
   1. not helpful to 5. very helpful
2. The degree to which you feel the counselor understands the student
   1. very little understanding to 5. very much understanding
3. Indicate the level at which you would feel free to relate to the counselor.
   1. I would attempt to avoid any kind of interaction or relationship with this person.
   2. If no one else were available, I might consult this person for specific information of a factual, e.g. educational or vocational nature, but I would avoid any personal exposure.
   3. I would be willing to talk with this person about factual, e.g. educational or vocational concerns, and some of the personal meanings connected with these.
   4. I would be willing to talk with this

person about many of my personal concerns.
5. I have the feeling that I could probably talk with this person about almost anything.

Are there any questions?

The first episode you see will be for practice. Listen and watch carefully; then mark the items on the rating sheet provided. Each episode is numbered. Write the episode number in the space provided on the rating sheet.

Counselor Rating Form

Episode Number ________

1. Degree you feel counselor is helpful:

	1	2	3	4	5	
not helpful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	very helpful

2. Degree you feel counselor understands the problem:

	1	2	3	4	5	
not understanding	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	very understanding

MARK ONE ONLY

3. Degree to which you would place your confidence in the counselor to help you with your problems:

___ Level 1: I would attempt to avoid any kind of interaction or relationship with this person.

___ Level 2: If no one else were available, I might consult this person for specific information of a factual, e.g. educational or vocational nature, but I would avoid any personal exposure.

___ Level 3: I would be willing to talk with this person about factual, e.g. educational or vocational concerns, and some of the personal meanings connected with these.

___ Level 4: I would be willing to talk with this person about many of my personal concerns.

___ Level 5: I have the feeling that I could probably talk with this person about almost anything.

Appendix B

Westcott Problem Solving Scale (Revised)

Instructions

Enter your name in the upper right corner in the space provided on the test.

Here are 15 problems for you to solve. Each numbered problem is separate from the others. Clues are provided to help you arrive at the solution for each problem. You are to solve each problem using as few clues as possible.

For each problem the clues which will help you solve it are covered by silver boxes. Erasing the silver box allows you to see the clue. There is a clue under each silver box.

In some of the problems part of the answer is already printed in the Answer Column, so be sure to look at the Answer Column before you attack each problem. In reaching your solution to any problem you must reach a final solution as though you had used ALL THE CLUES for that problem--both those you have seen and those you have not seen.

If you think you know the solution to a problem without looking any any clue, go ahead and write it in the Answer Column. If you want to see a clue, erase the first silver box. If, when you see the clue, you think you know the answer, write it down. If not, erase the next box, and so on until you either reach a solution or you have exhausted the supply of clues. Use the clues in order. Give a solution to each problem no matter how unsure you may be.

Your first reaction may be--"but what is the problem?" The use of clues will help you decide what the problem is-- and then help you arrive at the solution to it.

YOU MAY USE THE BACK OF THIS SHEET FOR SCRATCH PAPER IF YOU WISH.

REMEMBER: THE OBJECT IS TO WORK OUT THE SOLUTION TO EACH PROBLEM USING AS FEW CLUES AS POSSIBLE.

Westcott Problem Solving Scale (Revised)

(without overlay)

Name ______________________

	PROBLEM	CLUES					ANSWERS
1.	over under	in out	short long	down up	black white		high ________
2.	12321	23432	34543	45654	56765		____________
3.	DRAB BAR	LOT TO	TRAP PAR	TAPS SPA	TRAM MAR		STEM ________
4.	Carouse	arouse	rouse	ouse	use		____________
5.	no tone	ma name	at star	lo fold	mi time		________wasp
6.	325-1957	732-6195	573-2619	957-3261	195-7326		____________
7.	BC	CD	DE	EF	FG		____________
8.	carts cart	holds hold	form for	howl how	bar ba		so ________
9.	FAT	GET	HAT	IET	JAT		____________
10.	Stripe 123456	Strip 12345	Trip 2345	Pier 5463	Pest 5613		Sip________
11.	N	NE	E	SE	S		____________
12.	DOC DUD	RID ROE	SEW SIX	COD CUE	TAM TEN		TAR ________
13.	312-4	8-2	15-4	351-1	242-2		216________
14.	9N	8E	6S	4F	7S		2__________
15.	3692-4	216874-6	31-2	26915-5	9-1		6857392______

Appendix C

Definitions of Counseling Approaches

Advice Giving Approach:

There is some question in the literature as to the "purity" of this approach. It is thought that it may be supporting to some degree. Advice as conceptualized here is the counselor suggestion of a specific action of how to solve the problem. As Williamson has pointed out "... the counselor is ready to advise with the student as to a program of action...."

Questioning Approach:

The counselor will pose a question to the client prior to each client response. This type of approach resembles that suggested for the initial interview by Fromm-Reichman (1950).

Reflection of Feeling Approach:

The counselor will respond with feeling appropriate to the content of client responses. This approach is consistent with that proposed by Rogers (1962).

Supporting Approach:

The counselor in this approach attempts to convey to the client that the client has "what it takes" to work the problem out and with a little help everything will come out all right.

Information Giving Approach:

The counselor provides information of a specific nature to the counselee which he (the counselor) considers relevant to the problem at hand. (Michael & Meyerson, 1962).

Appendix D

Film Production Scripts

PRACTICE
(male)

Co: How can I help you Tom?

Cl: Well, last week our teacher passed out the choice slips for next year, and I am not sure what courses I ought to take.

Co: In making decisions of this kind you should keep in mind what you intend to do after high school.

Cl: Yes...I know. I plan on going on to State University.

Co: Have you given much thought about what you want to study when you get to the University?

Cl: I kinda thought I'd like to go into law, but there are a lot of opportunities in business management also.

Co: It's difficult to prepare for something when you don't know exactly what it is you're preparing for.

Cl: Yes sir, that's about the way I feel ... I don't know what to take 'cause I don't know what I'll need.

Co: Do you have the suggested list of courses for college preparatory work that was sent out with the choice slips?

Cl: Yes ... I have looked that over ... the required courses in math, English, and social studies are pretty well set. It's the electives that I'm not sure about.

Co: Are there any courses on the list that particularly attracted your interest?

Cl: Yeah -- ha ha (little laugh) I like P.E. ... but then, that won't help me much in college.

Co: You feel these electives are important in getting you ready for college.

Cl: That's right. I think they will be the difference between a good solid background and a weak one.

Co: Sounds like you already have a good idea as to which of the courses listed for next year would give you the best background.

Cl: Well...I thought speech would help me in any occupation...and I like speech, particularly debate. (Pause) Then there's that special composition class Mrs. Brown teaches ... that's hard but the kids say she really gets you ready for college.

Co: Looks like you have done some fairly serious thinking. Those appear to be pretty sound choices for anything you might meet later on.

Cl: Yeah ... even if I change my mind about law or management, those would still be pretty good.

Co: Have you talked about these choices with your parents?

Cl: Yeah, well they want me to go to college, but they have pretty much left it up to me as to what I want to study. They wanted me to talk to you to see what ideas you had though.

Co: Fine, I suggest that you talk to your parents about these two particular choices. If they are alright with them, then go ahead and put them down as your choices for electives for next year.

Cl: O.K. I'll do that ... thanks for the help.

Co: Come by any time.

ADVISING
(male)

Co: Hello, John. Sit right down and relax. What can I do for you?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies....

Co: I can probably advise you of some steps to take. First, suppose you tell me what it's about.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework. I'm just lazy I guess.

Co: Perhaps you should set a regular time to do your homework.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the other guys, or playing ball.

Co: Well, we all need to balance work with a reasonable amount of recreation and leisure, so let's set up a schedule that will help you to use your time more efficiently.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework. I just do it any time--and sometimes let it go until after supper. Then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: We could plan certain subjects before dinner and the rest afterwards. Then you could study them all easily.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--Sometimes I know most of the stuff--and if you just read the books on certain points you know it--and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: Well, it's sometimes hard to see the value of careful, thorough study immediately, but I suspect in the long run you'll do much better if you try harder in an organized, planned way.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: Then I think it's especially important that we do some long-range planning...

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we all should go to college, and boys can make their way easier than girls--so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: There are several alternative ways of financing a college education if you really want one. But first, let's lay out some specific steps you can take to assure better results with your present studies. This might help reassure your Dad, too.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: I would advise every young person to look ahead and get as much education as possible.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: With some sensible planning, and then sticking to what you set for yourself to do, I think you'll find your grades will improve.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: Let's make some definite plans and then you can talk to him. Perhaps if you tried to talk to him in a different way.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely--we'll make an appointment.

QUESTIONING
(male)

Co: Hello, John. What brings you in to see me today?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: What seems to be the trouble?

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm just lazy, I guess.

Co: Do you find it hard to get started on your homework or is sticking with it more the problem?

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time down at the drive-in with the other guys, or playing ball?

Co: You do this every afternoon?

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework--I just do it anytime--and sometimes let it go until after supper--then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: Does this fairly--uh--casual attitude bother you sometimes?

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--sometimes I know most of the stuff--and if you just read the books on certain points you know it--and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: Do you mean that you're really getting just about everything out of school that you want, ... that you think is important?

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: Do you want to win a scholarship for college?

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we all should go to college, and boys can make their way easier than girls--so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: How far did your father go in school?

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Do you and your father agree that it would be best for you to get a college education?

Cl: I just don't like school much--I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: Do you think not doing as well as your sister gradewise has affected your whole outlook in school?

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: How do you try to talk to him?

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely, we'll make an appointment.

INFORMATION GIVING
(Male)

Co: Hello, John. What can we offer you today?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: O.K., I probably have the information you need.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm just lazy I guess.

Co: Poor study habits result in poor grades usually.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time down at the drive-in with the other guys, or playing ball.

Co: Well, certainly some play is good for you and your work. But the trouble usually comes when things get out of balance.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework--I just do it anytime, and sometimes let it go until after supper--then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: The best results are obtained from regular, consistent study of all subjects.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework. Sometimes I know most of the stuff--and if you just read the books on certain points you know it, and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: But regularity seems to be the key to better grades.

Cl: I really do want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: Grades are important for scholarships because colleges want to know you can do the work but the financial needs of the student are usually taken into consideration also in the granting of many scholarships.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we should go to college, and boys can make their way easier than girls, so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: Well, I can get scholarship information for you, and also find out exactly what the trouble is in your courses. Your Dad probably reacts that way because he knows the importance of grades and is worried about finances also.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: It is a pretty well known fact that college graduates have much better incomes than high school graduates.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: When your grades get better, I believe you will like school better. We usually like the things we do well.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: He probably needs more specific information so there won't be so many unknowns in the situtation. In a situation like this, knowing the facts usually makes everyone feel more on top of things.

Cl: Well I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely,--we'll make an appointment.

REFLECTION OF FEELING
(male)

Co: Hello, John. You look a little bit bothered this morning. Can I help?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: You're not quite sure, but you felt I might help you with your studies.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm just lazy, I guess

Co: You mean it's your own outlook or maybe habits that get in your way.

Cl: Yeah, well...I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the other guys, or playing ball.

Co: Uh-huh. It is a lot of fun being with the gang, but then you feel bad later because you don't have your homework done.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework--I just do it any time--and sometimes let it go until after supper, then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: You mean you usually feel like putting it off, like it isn't really important.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework. Sometimes I know most of the stuff, and if you just read the books on certain points you know it, and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: In other words, you feel fairly confident that you get what's important without a lot of work, and the rest of it seems like a waste of time anyway.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: These grades really are important to you--and to your Dad.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we all should go to college, and boys can make their way easier than girls--so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: ...A lot of pressure on you--school work and dad...

Cl: Well Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Sometimes you wonder about it--not sure that it's what you want to do.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I just get tired to trying.

Co: Feel like there's not much use in trying when you don't like it--and it never works anyway...

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: You mean he has his mind set one way--can't really understand your feelings about the situation.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy, which reminds me, I've got to get to class--can I come back again?

Co: Surely, we'll make an appointment.

SUPPORTING
(male)

Co: Hello there, John. You're looking good this morning. Nice to see you. How can I help you?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured, I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies...

Co: Together we ought to be able to work it out. Can you tell me a little more about it.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework. I'm just lazy I guess.

Co: Maybe you're jumping to too quick a conclusion about yourself, John.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time down at the drive-in with the other guys, or playing ball.

Co: There's nothing wrong with playing ball and visiting. Playing ball is lots of fun and good exercise too, and if we organize your time a little better, I'm sure you can get better grades also. We can work that out together.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework. I just do it anytime, and sometimes let it go until after supper. Then I can only do the important ones and just let the other go.

Co: So you do keep up with some of them.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--sometimes I know most of the stuff, and if you just read the books on certain points you know it, and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: Yes, I'm sure there is some of it that you already know and it probably would not help your grades to study it.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship. My father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: There are lots of scholarships available these days, John, and I don't know why you shouldn't have as good a chance as the next person.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we all should go to college, and boys can make their way easier than girls--so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: I can see you're in kind of a tough spot, but I think that together we can get things worked out. This might make your Dad feel more relaxed about the whole thing.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Your father is thinking of your best interests the same as I am. All three of us working together should be able to find the solution.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did, so I get tired of trying.

Co: You can probably do as well as she did, or even better and then things will be better for you.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: Your father probably wants to talk to you but may not know how. We can figure out a way to get him to listen--we'll try.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely, we'll make an appointment.

PRACTICE
(female)

Co: How can I help you Betty?

Cl: Well, last week our teacher passed out the choice slips for next year, and I am not sure what courses I ought to take.

Co: In making decisions of this kind you should keep in mind what you intend to do after high school.

Cl: Yes ... I know. I plan on going on to State University.

Co: Have you given much thought about what you want to study when you get to the University?

Cl: I kinda thought I'd like to go into teaching, but I'm not sure yet what subject I want to teach.

Co: It's difficult to prepare for something when you don't know exactly what it is you're preparing for.

Cl: Yes sir, that's about the way I feel ... I don't know what to take 'cause I don't know what I'll need.

Co: Do you have the suggested list of courses for college preparatory work that was sent out with the choice slips?

Cl: Yes ... I have looked that over ... the required courses in math, English, and social studies are all pretty well set. It's the electives that I'm not sure about.

Co: Are there any courses on the list that particularly attracted your interest?

Cl: Yeah -- ha ha (little laugh) I like modern dance, but then that won't help me much in college.

Co: You feel these electives are important in getting you ready for college.

Cl: That's right. I think they will be the difference between a good solid background and a weak one.

Co: Sounds like you already have a good idea as to which of the courses listed for next year would give you the best background.

Cl: Well ... I thought speech would help me in any occupation ... and I like speech--particularly drama. (Pause) Then there's that special composition class Mrs. Brown teaches ... that's hard but the kids say she really gets you ready for college.

Co: Looks like you have done some fairly serious thinking. Those appear to be pretty sound choices for anything you might meet later on.

Cl: Yeah ... even if I change my mind about teaching, those would still be pretty good.

Co: Have you talked about these choices with your parents?

Cl: Yeah, well they want me to go to college, but they have pretty much left it up to me as to what I want to study. They wanted me to talk to you to see what ideas you had though.

Co: Fine, I suggest that you talk to your parents about these two particular choices. If they are alright with them, then go ahead and put them down as your choices for electives for next year.

Cl: O.K. I'll do that ... thanks for the help.

Co: Come by any time.

ADVISING
(female)

Co: Hello, Joan. Sit right down and relax. What can I do for you?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh) I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: I can probably advise you of some steps to take. First, suppose you tell me what it's about.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework. I'm just lazy I guess.

Co: Perhaps you should set a regular time to do your homework.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the group, or talking with the girls.

Co: Well, we all need to balance work with a reasonable amount of recreation and leisure, so let's set up a schedule that will help you to use your time more efficiently.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework. I just do it any time--and sometimes let it go until after supper. Then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: We could plan certain subjects before dinner and the rest afterwards. Then you could study them all easily.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--sometimes I know most of the stuff--and if you just read the books on certain points you know it--and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: Well, it's sometimes hard to see the value of careful, thorough study immediately, but I suggest in the long run you'll do much better if you try harder in an organized, planned way.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: Then I think it's especially important that we do some long-range planning....

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we should all go to college; so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: There are several alternative ways of financing a college education if you really want one. But first, let's lay out some specific steps you can take to assure better results with your present studies. This might help reassure your Dad, too.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: I would advise every young person to look ahead and get as much education as possible.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: With some sensible planning, and then sticking to what you set for yourself to do, I think you'll find your grades will improve.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: Let's make some definite plans and then you can talk to him. Perhaps if you tried to talk to him in a different way.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely--we'll make an appointment.

QUESTIONING
(female)

Co: Hello, Joan. What brings you in to see me today?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: What seems to be the trouble?

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm just lazy, I guess.

Co: Do you find it hard to get started on your homework or is sticking with it more the problem?

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the group, or talking with the girls.

Co: You do this every afternoon?

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework--I just do it anytime--and sometimes let it go until after supper--then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: Does this fairly --uh--casual attitude bother you sometimes?

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--sometimes I know most of the stuff--and if you read the books on certain points you know it--and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: Do you mean that you're really getting just about everything out of school that you want, ... that you think is important?

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: Do you want to win a scholarship for college?

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we should all go to college; so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: How far did your father go in school?

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Do you and your father agree that it would be best for you to get a college education.

Cl: I just don't like school much--I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: Do you think not doing as well as your sister grade-wise has affected your whole attitude in school?

Cl: Well--I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: How do you try to talk to him?

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely--we'll make an appointment.

INFORMATION GIVING
(female)

Co: Hello, Joan. What can we offer you today?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: O.K., I probably have the information you need.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm just lazy I guess.

Co: Poor study habits result in poor grades usually.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the group, or talking with the girls.

Co: Well, certainly some play is good for you and your work. But the trouble usually comes when things get out of balance.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework--I just do it anytime, and sometimes let it go until after supper--then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: The best results are obtained from regular, consistent study of all subjects.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework. Sometimes I know most of the stuff--and if you just read the books on certain points you know it, and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: But regularity seems to be the key to better grades.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: Grades are important for scholarships because colleges want to know you can do the work but the financial needs of the student are usually taken into consideration also in the granting of many scholarships.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we all should go to college; and if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: Well, I can get scholarship information for you, and also find out exactly what the trouble is in your courses. Your Dad probably reacts that way because he knows the importance of grades and is worried about finances also.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: It is a pretty well known fact that college graduates have much better incomes than high school graduates.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I get tired of trying.

Co: When your grades get better, I believe you will like school better. We usually like the things we do well.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: He probably needs more specific information so there won't be so many unknowns in the situation. In a situation like this, knowing the facts usually makes everyone feel more on top of things.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely--we'll make an appointment.

REFLECTION OF FEELING
(female)

Co: Hello, Joan. You look a little bit bothered this morning. Can I help?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured--I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies.

Co: You're not quite sure, but you felt I might help you with your studies.

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework--I'm just lazy, I guess.

Co: You mean it's your own outlook or maybe habits that get in your way.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the group, or talking with the girls.

Co: Uh-huh. It is a lot of fun being with the gang but then you feel bad later because you don't have your homework done.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework--I just do it anytime--and sometimes let it go until after supper--then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: You mean you usually feel like putting it off, like it isn't really important.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--Sometimes I know most of the stuff, and if you just read the books on certain points you know it, and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: In other words, you feel fairly confident that you get what's important without a lot of work, and the rest of it seems like a waste of time anyway.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship--my father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: These grades really are important to you--and to your Dad.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we should all go to college; so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: ... A lot of pressure on you ... school work and Dad ...

Cl: Well, Dad didn't go to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Sometimes you wonder about it--not sure that it's what you want to do.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did--so I just get tired of trying.

Co: Feel like there's not much use in trying when you don't like it--and it never works anyway...

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: You mean he has his mind set one way--can't really understand your feelings about the situation.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy, which reminds me, I've got to get to class--can I come back again?

Co: Surely, we'll make an appointment.

SUPPORTING
(female)

Co: Hello there, Joan. You're looking good this morning. Nice to see you. How can I help you?

Cl: To tell the truth, I don't know (little laugh). I figured, I came here 'cause I figured maybe you'd help me out with my studies...

Co: Together we ought to be able to work it out. Can you tell me a little more about it?

Cl: Well, I have trouble doing my homework. I'm just lazy I guess.

Co: Maybe you're jumping to too quick a conclusion about yourself, Joan.

Cl: Yeah, well I spend most of my time at the drive-in with the group or talking with the girls.

Co: There's nothing wrong with talking and visiting. Having friends is fun and important, and if we organize your time a little better I'm sure you can get better grades also. We can work that out together.

Cl: Yeah, I haven't any regular time for homework. I just do it anytime, and sometimes let it go until after supper. Then I can only do the important ones and just let the others go.

Co: So you do keep up with some of them.

Cl: It's kinda hard to explain how I feel about homework--sometimes I know most of the stuff, and if you just read the books on certain points you know it, and I don't feel that I need it actually, so I don't do it.

Co: Yes, I'm sure there is some of it that you already know and it probably would not help your grades to study it.

Cl: I really want to make better grades, 'cause I need to get a scholarship. My father wants me to go to college. He can't do it the way things are 'cause I got a sister in college.

Co: There are lots of scholarships available these days, Joan, and I don't know why you shouldn't have as good a chance as the next person.

Cl: Well, Dad thinks we should all go to college; so if I can't get a scholarship, I'll have to work my way through school. Dad really rides me about my grades.

Co: I can see you're in a kind of a tough spot, but I think that together we can get things worked out. This might make your Dad feel more relaxed about the whole thing too.

Cl: Well, Dad didn't got to college, and he doesn't want us to have as hard a time as he did, but I don't know.

Co: Your father is thinking of your best interests the same as I am. All three of us working together should be able to find the solution.

Cl: I just don't like school much, and I don't ever make as good grades as my sister did, so I get tired of trying.

Co: You probably can do as well as she did, or even better and then things will be better for you.

Cl: Well, I don't know how much chance I have, and Dad just won't listen to me.

Co: Your father probably wants to talk to you but may not know how. We can figure out a way to get him to listen--we'll try.

Cl: Well, I--he's just always so busy--which reminds me, I've got to get to class. Can I come back again?

Co: Surely, we'll make an appointment.

REFERENCES

Arbuckle, D. S. *Counseling: an introduction.* Boston: Allyn Bacon, Inc., 1961.

Astin, A. W. The functional autonomy of psychotherapy. *Amer. Psychologist*, 1961, 16, 75-78.

Barrett-Lennard, G. T. Dimensions of therapist response as causal factors in therapeutic change. *Psychol. Monogr.*, 1962, *76*, No. 43 (Whole No. 562).

Betz, B. J. & Whitehorn, J. C. The relationship of the therapist to the outcome of therapy in schizophrenia. *Psychiat. Res. Rep.*, 1956, *5*, 89-140.

Blau, T. H. Report on a method of predicting success in psychotherapy. *J. clin. Psychol.*, 1950, *6*, 403-406.

Bordin, E. S. *Psychological counseling*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1955, Ch. 11.

Bown, O. H. An investigation of therapeutic relationship in client-centered therapy. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univer. of Chicago, 1954.

Buchheimer, A. & Balogh, S. C. *The counseling relationship*. Chicago: Science Research Associates, 1961.

Campbell, R. E. Counselor personality and background and his interview subrole behavior. *J. counsel. Psychol*., 1962, 9, 329-334.

Cartwright, Rosalind D. & Vogel, J. L. A comparison of changes in psychoneurotic patients during matched periods of therapy and no therapy. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1960, 24, 121-127.

Cross, H. J. The outcome of psychotherapy: a selected analysis of research findings. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1964, *28*, 413-417.

Crutchfield, R. S. Conformity and character. Amer. Psychol., 1955, 10, 191-198.

Danskin, David G. Roles played by counselors in their interviews. J. counsel. Psychol., 1955, 2, 22-27.

Davis, S. E. & Robinson, F. P. A study of the use of certain techniques for reducing resistance during the counseling interview. Educ. psychol. Measmt., 1949, 9, 297-306.

Eaton, J. W. The client-practicioner relationship as a variable in the evaluation of treatment outcome. Psychiat., 1959, 22, 189-195.

Fey, W. F. Doctrine and experience: their influence upon the psychotherapist. J. consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 403-409.

Fiedler, F. E. A comparison of therapeutic relationships in psychoanalytic, non-directive and Adlerian therapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1950, 14, 436-445. (a)

Fiedler, F. E. Quantitative studies on the role of therapists' feelings toward their patients. In O. H. Mowrer (Ed.), Psychotherapy theory and research. New York: Ronald Press, 1953, Pp. 296-316.

Frank, J. D. Problem of controls in psychotherapy, as exemplified by psychotherapy research project of Phipps Psychiatric Clinic. In E. A. Rubinstein & M. B. Parloff (Eds.), Research in psychotherapy. Vol. 1. Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association, 1958, Pp. 10-26.

Fromm-Reichmann, Frieda. Principles of intensive psychotherapy. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1950.

Fruchter, B. Introduction to factor analysis. New York: Van Nostrand, 1954.

Gonyea, G. G. The "ideal therapeutic relationship" and counseling outcome. The University of Texas Testing and Counseling Center, Research Report No. 12, April 20, 1962.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental statistics in psychology and education. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, Inc., 1956.

Havighurst, R. J. Counseling adolescent girls in the 1960's. Vocational Guidance Quarterly, 1956, 13, 153-160.

Hemby, Jo Nell Schutz. Adolescents' perceptions of the feminine role in today's society. Unpublished master's thesis, Univer. of Texas, 1965.

Inhelder, Barbel & Piaget, J. The growth of logical thinking. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1958.

Jones, M. C. A study of socialization patterns at high school level. J. genet. Psychol., 1958, 93, 87-111.

Jones, M. C. & Bayley, Nancy. Physical maturing among boys as related to behavior. J. educ. Psychol., 1950, 41, 129-148.

Kaiser, H. G. The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analysis. Psychometrika, 1958, 23, 187-200.

Katz, M. M., Lorr, M., & Rubinstein, E. A. Remainer patient attributes and their relation to subsequent improvement in psychotherapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 411-413.

Lesser, W. M. The relationship between counseling progress and empathetic understanding. J. counsel. Psychol., 1961, 8, 330-336.

Lindquist, E. F. Design and analysis of experiments in psychology and education. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1956.

Lorr, M., Katz, M. M., & Rubinstein, E. A. The prediction of length of stay in psychotherapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 321-327.

McCreary, W. E. An empirical derivation of hypotheses related to individually characteristic approaches to school counseling situations. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univer. of Wisconsin, 1962.

McNair, D. M. & Lorr, M. An analysis of professed psychotherapeutic techniques. J. consult. Psychol., 1964, 28, 265-271.

Michael J. & Meyerson, L. A behavioral approach to counseling and guidance. Harvard Educ. Rev., 1962 32, 382-402.

Morse, J. A study of verbal expression of value judgments by counselors during counseling interviews. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Univer. of Texas, 1956.

Mussen, P. H. & Jones, M. C. Self conceptions, motivations, and interpersonal attitudes of late and early maturing boys. Child Develpm., 1957, 28, 225.

Myers, J. K. & Auld, F. Some variables related to outcome of psychotherapy. J. clin. Psychol., 1955, 11, 51-54.

Overall, B. & Aronson, H. Expectations of psychotherapy in patients of lower socio-economic class. Amer. J. Orthopsychiat., 1963, 33, 421-430.

Parloff, M. B. Therapist-patient relationships and outcome of psychotherapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1961, 25, 29-38.

Pierce-Jones, John. Personal Communication, 1964.

Robinson, F. P. Principles and procedures in student counseling. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950.

Rogers, C. R. Counseling and psychotherapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1951.

Rogers, C. R. The interpersonal relationship: the core of guidance. *Harvard Educ. Rev.*, 1962, *32*, 417-429.

Seeman, J. A study of preliminary interview methods in vocational counseling. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1948, *12*, 321-330.

Seeman, J. A study of the process of non-directive therapy. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1949, *13*, 157-168.

Shaffer, L. F. & Shoben, E. J., Jr. *The psychology of adjustment*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1956.

Sherman, Dorothy. An analysis of the dynamic relationship between counselor techniques and outcomes in larger units of the interview situation. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State Univer., 1945.

Snyder, W. K. An investigation of the nature of non-directive psychotherapy. *J. gen. Psychol.*, 1945, *33*, 1930224.

Snyder, W. U. *The psychotherapy relationship*. New York: Macmillan, 1961.

Steph, Josaph A. Responses to hypothetical counseling situations as a predictor of relationship orientation in school counselors. Unpublished doctoral dissertaion, Univer. of Wisconsin, 1963.

Stevenson, I. The challenge of results in psychotherapy. *Amer. J. Psychiat.*, 1959, *116*, 120-123.

Steiper, D. R. & Wiener, D. N. The problem of interminability in out-patient psychotherapy. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1959, *23*, 237-242.

Streitfield, J. W. Expressed acceptance of self and others by psychotherapists. *J. consult. Psychol.* 1959, *23*, 435-441.

Sullivan, P. L., Miller, Christine, & Smelser, W. Factors in length of stay and progress in psychotherapy. J. consult. Psychol., 1958, 22, 1-9.

Sundland, D. M. & Barker, E. N. The orientations of psychotherapists. J. consult Psychol., 1962, 26, 201-212.

van der Veen, Ferdinand. The perceptions by clients and by judges of conditions offered by the therapist in the therapist relationship. Discussion papers, Wisconsin Psychiatric Institute, No. 15, September, 1961, The University of Wisconsin. (a)

van der Veen, Ferdinand. The conditions offered by the therapist as perceived by clients and by judges. Paper presented at the National Convention of the APA in New York, September, 1961. (b)

Westcott, M. R. A method for the study of creativity as a special case of problem solving. Paper presented at APA meetings, New York, April, 1960. (a)

Westcott, M. R. On the measurement of intuitive leaps. Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association meetings, New York, April, 1960. (b)

Westcott, M. R. On the measurement of intuitive leaps. Psychol. Reports, 1961, 9, 274.

Westcott, M. R. Inference, guess work and creativity. Cooperative Research Project 684, U. S. Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, 1962. (a)

Westcott, M. R. Empirical studies of intuition. Talk given at the 1962 University of Utah Research Conference on the Identification of Creative Scientific Talent, held at Mount Majestic Lodge, Brighton, Utah, June, 1962. (b)

Westcott, M. R. & Ranzoni, J. H. Correlates of intuitive thinking. Paper presented at Eastern Psychological Association meetings, Atlantic City, New Jersey, April, 1962.

White, A. M., Frichtenbaum, L. & Dollard, J. Measure for predicting dropping out of psychotherapy. *J. consult. Psychol.*, 1964, *28*, 326-332.

Whitehorn, J. C. & Betz, B. J. A study of psychotherapeutic relationships between physicians and schizophrenic patients. *Amer. J. Psychiat.*, 1954, *111*, 321-331.

Whitehorn, J. C. & Betz, B. J. Further studies of the doctor as a crucial variable in the outcome of treatment with schizophrenic patients. *Amer. J. Psychiat.*, 1960, *117*, 215-223.

Williamson, E. G. *Counseling adolescents*. New York: McGraw Hill, 1950.

Wilson, C. W. The development of structure in attitudes in adolescence. Paper presented at APA meetings, Philadelphia, Pa., 1963.

Windle, C. Psychological tests in psychopathological prognosis. *Psychol. Bull.*, 1952, *49*, 451-475.